Prophecy Over Children: Evangelical Dispensationalism, the Israel Exception, Domestic Austerity, and Moral Blindness in American Public Policy

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

June 17, 2026

This paper examines how American evangelical dispensationalism can create an "Israel exception" within conservative politics: a belief that support for the modern State of Israel is biblically mandatory even when comparable concern is denied to vulnerable people at home. The argument is not that every evangelical, dispensationalist, Christian Zionist, or supporter of Israel embraces the same policies. Rather, it investigates a recurring political pattern in which military aid, diplomatic protection, and theological loyalty to Israel are treated as sacred commitments, while Medicaid, food assistance, disability services, rehabilitation, maternal care, and rural health infrastructure are treated as optional expenses. The consequences are especially serious for children, whose suffering may be obscured by budgetary language, partisan identity, nationalism, and prophetic narratives. American, Israeli, and Palestinian children can all become secondary to political symbolism, military strategy, or eschatological expectation. The paper argues that this hierarchy is neither required by Scripture nor consistent with the moral teachings of Jesus concerning mercy, justice, peacemaking, and protection of the vulnerable. It concludes by proposing a child-centered Christian ethic for evaluating foreign and domestic policy.

Keywords: evangelical dispensationalism, Christian Zionism, Israel exception, America First, children, domestic austerity, Medicaid cuts, foreign military aid, biblical interpretation, evangelical politics, moral blindness, pro-life ethics, Palestinian children, Israeli children, American children, public policy, eschatology, social welfare, political theology, selective compassion.

OpenAI GPT-5.5 Thinking. CC4.0. 120 pages and 91 references.

https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4206-4253

Outline

1. Introduction: Prophecy, Public Policy, and the Invisible Child

1.1 The central problem

Introduce the apparent contradiction between evangelical support for an "America First" political agenda and the treatment of Israel as an exception to its restrictions on foreign aid, military commitments, and overseas intervention.

1.2 From inconsistency to moral blindness

Explain why the phenomenon should be understood as more than political inconsistency or hypocrisy. Define blindness as a structured inability or unwillingness to perceive suffering that conflicts with a protected theological and political narrative.

1.3 Children as the primary moral test

Establish children as the paper's central concern. Explain why the effects of health-care cuts, food insecurity, war, displacement, disability, and family instability are most consequential when imposed upon children.

1.4 Central thesis

Present the argument that dispensationalist political theology can elevate loyalty to the modern State of Israel above consistent biblical concern for justice, mercy, peace, and vulnerable human life.

1.5 Scope and necessary distinctions

Distinguish among evangelicalism, dispensationalism, Christian Zionism, Judaism, the Jewish people, the biblical people of Israel, the modern State of Israel, Israeli citizens, Israeli governments, and particular Israeli policies.

2. The Historical Construction of Evangelical Christian Zionism

2.1 The emergence of modern dispensationalism

Examine the development of dispensational theology in the nineteenth century and its division of history into distinct divine administrations or dispensations.

2.2 John Nelson Darby and prophetic systematization

Discuss Darby's role in developing a prophetic framework that separated Israel and the Church and anticipated a future restoration of national Israel.

2.3 The Scofield Reference Bible

Analyze how the Scofield Bible popularized dispensational interpretations among American Protestants by embedding theological commentary alongside the biblical text.

2.4 Fundamentalism, prophecy conferences, and mass communication

Trace the spread of dispensationalism through churches, Bible institutes, radio, publishing, prophecy conferences, and evangelistic movements.

2.5 The creation of the modern State of Israel

Explain how the establishment of Israel in 1948 was interpreted by many dispensationalists as confirmation of biblical prophecy.

2.6 From theological expectation to political program

Show how a belief about prophetic fulfillment evolved into organized political support for military aid, diplomatic protection, territorial claims, and American strategic alignment.

2.7 The contemporary Christian Zionist network

Examine the interconnected roles of pastors, broadcasters, authors, lobbying organizations, political campaigns, donors, conferences, and religious tourism.

3. Is the Israel Exception Biblical?

3.1 Biblical Israel and the modern State of Israel

Examine the theological and historical problems involved in treating the modern secular nation-state as completely identical to biblical covenantal Israel.

3.2 Genesis 12:3 and the politics of blessing

Analyze the frequently cited promise to Abraham and question whether it constitutes a command for twenty-first-century American military and financial policy.

3.3 Covenant did not eliminate accountability

Show how the Hebrew prophets condemned Israel's rulers, warfare, injustice, exploitation, idolatry, and mistreatment of vulnerable people.

3.4 The prophetic tradition against national immunity

Explain why covenantal status intensified moral accountability rather than exempting Israel from criticism.

3.5 Jesus, the Kingdom of God, and national power

Examine Jesus' teachings concerning children, enemies, neighbors, peacemaking, political domination, mercy, and the vulnerable.

3.6 Paul, Israel, and Gentile humility

Consider Romans 9–11 and distinguish Paul's warning against Gentile arrogance from a command to support every policy of a future Israeli state.

3.7 The absence of a New Testament foreign-policy mandate

Demonstrate that the New Testament contains no instruction requiring Christian governments to finance, arm, or diplomatically protect a modern nation-state.

3.8 Honor without unconditional political allegiance

Develop a position that rejects antisemitism and honors the Jewish people without granting any government immunity from moral judgment.

4. The Israel Exception to "America First"

4.1 "America First" as a political rather than biblical doctrine

Clarify that national self-prioritization is not itself a Christian command and must be evaluated by broader principles of justice and neighbor-love.

4.2 Opposition to foreign aid with one protected exception

Examine why many conservative voters oppose international assistance generally while treating aid to Israel as untouchable.

4.3 Opposition to military entanglement with one protected exception

Consider the contradiction between noninterventionist rhetoric and willingness to accept escalating military commitments connected to Israel.

4.4 Borders, sovereignty, and selective nationalism

Compare demands that the United States prioritize its own borders and citizens with support for financing another nation's borders, military, and security systems.

4.5 Strategic arguments versus biblical claims

Distinguish legitimate strategic arguments for an alliance from the stronger and less defensible claim that the alliance is directly commanded by God.

4.6 The problem of permanent exemption

Analyze the democratic dangers of treating any foreign government as beyond ordinary debate, conditionality, oversight, or criticism.

5. The Mechanisms of Dispensationalist Blindness

5.1 Prophecy over proximity

Explain how distant territory can acquire greater sacred significance than the suffering of children, patients, and families living nearby.

5.2 Selective biblical literalism

Examine how passages concerning Israel are converted into government policy while biblical commands concerning poverty, sickness, strangers, and children are confined to private charity.

5.3 Partisan bundling

Show how Israel, abortion, immigration, judges, gun rights, taxation, and cultural conflict become packaged together so that commitment to one issue shields the others from scrutiny.

5.4 Sacred issues and automatic political consent

Analyze how a small number of nonnegotiable issues can cause voters to accept policies they have not independently examined.

5.5 The pastor–media–politician feedback loop

Describe how religious leaders, prophecy broadcasters, political candidates, lobbying groups, and partisan media reinforce the same interpretive framework.

5.6 Eschatological unfalsifiability

Explain how war, instability, international criticism, and failed diplomacy can all be interpreted as confirmation that prophecy is unfolding.

5.7 Apocalyptic expectation and diminished prevention

Consider how expectations of inevitable catastrophe can weaken commitment to diplomacy, environmental stewardship, social investment, and long-term peace.

5.8 Moral disengagement through sacred narrative

Examine how individuals can remain personally compassionate while supporting systems whose human consequences have been hidden by theological abstraction.

6. Domestic Austerity and the Evangelical Communities It Harms

6.1 Medicaid and restricted medical access

Examine reductions or restrictions affecting therapy, chronic-pain treatment, pediatric services, disability care, and low-income families.

6.2 Missouri's chronic-pain policy as a case study

Analyze the elimination of covered physical therapy, acupuncture, and chiropractic services within Missouri's chronic-pain program and the implications for non-opioid treatment.

6.3 The opioid-policy contradiction

Consider the inconsistency of condemning opioid dependency while reducing access to treatments intended to improve mobility and reduce reliance on medication.

6.4 Rural hospitals and disappearing providers

Explain how reimbursement cuts and financial pressure can eliminate clinics, maternity units, rehabilitation services, and local providers from rural communities.

6.5 Food assistance and childhood nutrition

Examine how restrictions on nutrition programs affect physical development, school performance, family stability, and long-term health.

6.6 Disability services and family burden

Analyze how reductions in public support transfer responsibility to parents, siblings, grandparents, churches, and unpaid caregivers.

6.7 Maternal health and early childhood

Connect prenatal care, birth outcomes, maternal mortality, infant health, and the stability of families with young children.

6.8 Work requirements and the punishment of illness

Explore the contradiction of requiring employment from adults while limiting the therapies, transportation, child care, and medical services that make employment possible.

6.9 Administrative cruelty without visible perpetrators

Show how human harm is concealed behind eligibility reviews, reimbursement schedules, optional-benefit classifications, documentation requirements, and procedural delays.

7. Children at the Center of the Moral Crisis

7.1 Why children must not remain a secondary concern

Explain children's limited political power, economic dependence, developmental vulnerability, and inability to choose the conditions imposed upon them.

7.2 American children affected by domestic policy

Examine children who lose health coverage, food support, therapy, stable housing, rural medical access, or parental economic security.

7.3 Palestinian children affected by war and occupation

Consider death, injury, displacement, hunger, interrupted education, family separation, damaged infrastructure, and chronic fear.

7.4 Israeli children affected by violence and militarization

Examine terrorism, hostage-taking, bereavement, displacement, rocket attacks, compulsory militarization, fear, and inherited trauma.

7.5 Selective innocence

Analyze how children may be assigned different degrees of innocence according to nationality, religion, ethnicity, or political usefulness.

7.6 Children reduced to symbols

Show how children can be used as evidence for one side's righteousness while the full humanity of children on the opposing side disappears.

7.7 Intergenerational trauma

Examine how violence, deprivation, humiliation, and bereavement shape psychological development and reproduce conflict across generations.

7.8 The child as a test of theological truth

Argue that a theology's moral credibility should be judged partly by whether it increases or diminishes sensitivity to endangered children.

8. Language, Abstraction, and the Concealment of Suffering

8.1 The bureaucratic vocabulary of domestic harm

Analyze expressions such as cost containment, eligibility reform, optional benefits, fiscal discipline, and personal responsibility.

8.2 The military vocabulary of foreign harm

Examine terms such as collateral damage, proportionality, human shields, security operations, evacuation zones, and acceptable losses.

8.3 Distance from consequences

Explain why policies enacted through budgets, agencies, weapons systems, and institutional procedures feel less personal than direct acts of harm.

8.4 Statistical children

Consider how casualty counts, enrollment totals, poverty rates, and budget projections can obscure individual children and families.

8.5 The disappearance of Palestinian Christians

Examine why Palestinian Christian communities complicate simplified narratives that divide the region into biblical Israel and hostile non-Christian adversaries.

8.6 Antisemitism accusations and the suppression of policy criticism

Distinguish genuine antisemitism from evidence-based criticism of a state, government, military action, lobbying campaign, or theological claim.

8.7 Media asymmetry and controlled visibility

Explore why some suffering receives names, photographs, biographies, and sustained attention while other suffering remains anonymous or unseen.

9. The Political Economy of Sacred and Disposable Spending

9.1 Who is considered deserving of government protection?

Compare the language used for domestic welfare recipients with the language used to justify military and diplomatic support for favored allies.

9.2 Entitlement at home and obligation abroad

Examine why health care and food assistance may be described as dependency while foreign military support is described as duty.

9.3 Protected and unprotected budgets

Analyze how some expenditures become politically untouchable while others are repeatedly subjected to austerity.

9.4 Deficits and selective fiscal alarm

Consider why deficits associated with tax reductions, defense spending, or favored geopolitical commitments receive different treatment from social expenditures.

9.5 Budget silos and displaced costs

Show how savings in one program can create greater costs through emergency care, disability, family instability, homelessness, incarceration, or lost productivity.

9.6 Military Keynesianism and welfare-state opposition

Examine the acceptance of government-directed spending when it benefits defense industries and strategic allies but not when it directly supports vulnerable households.

9.7 Symbolic compensation

Explain how voters may accept material losses in exchange for cultural recognition, religious affirmation, and political victories on sacred issues.

9.8 The child as an unrepresented economic interest

Discuss why children bear long-term consequences despite lacking votes, lobbying organizations, wealth, or control over public narratives.

10. Evangelical Political Self-Harm and Democratic Accountability

10.1 What does it mean to vote against one's interests?

Critique simplistic assumptions that voters act only according to immediate financial advantage.

10.2 Identity as a political benefit

Explain how religious recognition, group belonging, cultural status, and perceived moral victory can compensate psychologically for material loss.

10.3 Sacrifice interpreted as faithfulness

Analyze how economic hardship or reduced public support may be framed as evidence of independence, spiritual discipline, or resistance to secular government.

10.4 Coalition loyalty and suppressed dissent

Examine the social and religious costs imposed on evangelicals who question unconditional support for Israel or criticize conservative economic policy.

10.5 The invisibility of causal chains

Show why voters may fail to connect national elections with later changes in Medicaid eligibility, hospital closures, therapy coverage, school nutrition, or disability services.

10.6 Leaders rewarded for symbolism rather than outcomes

Analyze how political officials can maintain evangelical support through rhetoric, ceremonial actions, and foreign-policy gestures despite harmful domestic consequences.

10.7 Churches as sites of accountability or reinforcement

Consider whether churches help believers evaluate policy consequences or merely reproduce partisan interpretations.

10.8 Blindness without stupidity

Emphasize that the phenomenon does not require low intelligence. It can arise through motivated reasoning, trusted authority, social belonging, theological fear, and information control.

11. Toward a Child-Centered Christian Public Ethic

11.1 Jesus and the moral status of children

Examine Jesus' reception of children, warnings against harming little ones, and reversal of social hierarchies.

11.2 The least of these

Explore the relationship between Christian faithfulness and the treatment of people who are hungry, sick, displaced, imprisoned, impoverished, or powerless.

11.3 Impartial justice

Argue that Israeli, Palestinian, American, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, and secular children possess equal moral worth.

11.4 Peacemaking rather than prophetic acceleration

Reject the idea that Christians should welcome, excuse, or intensify conflict because it appears to correspond with an end-times timetable.

11.5 A consistent pro-life ethic

Extend concern for life beyond abortion to health care, nutrition, war, disability, poverty, maternal care, environmental danger, and childhood development.

11.6 Equal standards for every government

Propose that the United States, Israel, Palestinian authorities, Arab governments, Iran, and all other political actors be judged by consistent moral principles.

11.7 Conditionality and accountability

Consider whether military aid and diplomatic support should be tied to civilian protection, lawful conduct, transparency, and measurable strategic purposes.

11.8 Domestic policy as a Christian moral concern

Reject the assumption that compassion may be expressed only through private charity while public policy remains morally neutral.

11.9 A practical child-impact test

Propose that major domestic and foreign policies be evaluated by their foreseeable effects on children's survival, health, development, family stability, education, and future peace.

12. Conclusion: Seeing Children Before Prophecy

12.1 Summary of the argument

Restate how the Israel exception emerged, why it is not a direct biblical command, and how it can conceal harmful political consequences.

12.2 From inconsistency to blindness

Conclude that the central problem is not merely an ideological contradiction but a failure to perceive children whose suffering falls outside the protected narrative.

12.3 The danger of sacred immunity

Warn that no modern nation, political party, military alliance, or government policy should be placed beyond moral examination.

12.4 The recovery of evangelical moral vision

Call for a return to biblical principles of mercy, truth, justice, humility, peacemaking, and protection of the vulnerable.

12.5 Children as the measure of policy

Affirm that policies should be judged not only by strategic claims, economic totals, partisan victories, or prophetic expectations, but by what they do to actual children.

12.6 Final conclusion

Conclude that a theology that makes suffering children harder to see has not clarified biblical truth but obstructed it. Christian political responsibility begins when American, Israeli, and Palestinian children are seen as human beings before they are classified as costs, threats, symbols, or instruments of prophecy.

13. References

Numbered references will include biblical texts, primary theological works, historical studies of dispensationalism and Christian Zionism, government budget and policy documents, Medicaid and public-health materials, demographic research, child-welfare studies, conflict and casualty documentation, polling data, and major scholarly analyses of evangelical political behavior.

Art

1. Introduction: Prophecy, Public Policy, and the Invisible Child

1.1 The central problem

A striking contradiction has emerged within contemporary American evangelical politics. Many conservative Christians endorse an "America First" philosophy that emphasizes national sovereignty, restricted foreign commitments, reduced government spending, and skepticism toward international obligations. Yet these principles are frequently suspended when the modern State of Israel is involved. Military assistance, diplomatic protection, weapons transfers, and long-term strategic commitments to Israel are often treated not merely as debatable policies but as sacred duties. At the same time, domestic programs that protect vulnerable Americans are subjected to continual demands for retrenchment, stricter eligibility, work requirements, reduced reimbursement, or outright elimination.

This contradiction becomes morally urgent when the consequences fall upon children. Reductions in Medicaid, nutrition assistance, disability services, maternal care, rehabilitation, housing support, and rural medical infrastructure affect children who played no role in creating the fiscal or political conditions imposed upon them. They do not choose poverty, disability, parental illness, geographic isolation, or inadequate access to medical care. Nevertheless, their needs may be classified as optional, unaffordable, or conducive to dependency, while foreign military commitments are treated as permanent and unquestionable.

The concern of this paper is not that every expenditure on Israel directly subtracts money from a particular American child. State and federal budgets are complex, and different programs operate through different appropriations. The deeper issue is the hierarchy of political concern. Certain commitments are guarded as sacred, while others are exposed to austerity. The pattern reveals which lives, institutions, and obligations are regarded as politically negotiable.

The Israel exception is especially important because it is frequently defended in explicitly biblical language. Strategic arguments can be debated through evidence, costs, security assessments, and competing national interests. A theological claim operates differently. When support for a modern state is presented as obedience to God, ordinary political scrutiny can appear spiritually dangerous. Criticism may be recast as rebellion against Scripture, hostility toward the Jewish people, or refusal to participate in a divinely ordained prophetic program. Under these conditions, a foreign-policy preference can acquire immunity from the standards applied to other policies and nations.

1.2 From inconsistency to moral blindness

The problem should not be reduced to hypocrisy. Hypocrisy implies that people consciously proclaim one principle while knowingly violating it for convenience or advantage. Some political actors undoubtedly behave in this manner, but the larger phenomenon is more complex. Many

evangelical voters sincerely believe that their support for Israel is morally and biblically required. Their inconsistency may therefore arise not from deliberate deception but from a framework that determines what they are able to see.

Moral blindness is the failure to perceive or adequately respond to suffering because that suffering falls outside a protected narrative. It does not require cruelty, low intelligence, or the complete absence of compassion. People may be loving parents, generous church members, and attentive neighbors while remaining unable to recognize the consequences of policies they support. Their compassion operates within boundaries created by theology, partisan loyalty, media framing, social identity, and institutional trust.

Blindness is produced when some facts are made vivid and others remain abstract. Israeli vulnerability may be presented through history, personal testimony, biblical imagery, terrorism, national survival, and repeated appeals to covenant. Domestic policy harms, by contrast, may arrive through technical notices, budget language, reimbursement rules, eligibility reviews, and administrative classifications. Palestinian suffering may be compressed into military terminology or subordinated to arguments about security and terrorism. American children who lose therapy, nutrition, or medical access rarely appear in political rhetoric as identifiable human beings. They become enrollment figures, expenditure categories, or projected savings.

The result is not merely unequal information. It is unequal moral visibility. One population is seen through stories, symbols, theology, and historical memory. Another is seen through spreadsheets, regulations, or accusations of dependency. A child viewed as part of a sacred national story receives a different moral response from a child viewed as a budgetary liability.

This blindness can also be causal. Voters may not connect their support for national political leaders with later changes in state Medicaid rules, school nutrition programs, hospital finances, or disability services. Responsibility is dispersed across legislatures, agencies, courts, governors, contractors, and administrative systems. Because the harmful outcome is several steps removed from the original vote, no individual decision appears to have caused it. Political accountability dissolves into bureaucracy.

The concept of blindness therefore helps explain how sincere religious conviction can coexist with policies that undermine the health and security of the believer's own community. The problem is not that evangelicals are incapable of compassion. It is that compassion can be directed, filtered, and constrained by an interpretive system that assigns sacred importance to some forms of suffering while rendering others secondary.

1.3 Children as the primary moral test

Children provide the clearest test of this political theology because they cannot plausibly be held responsible for the conditions that harm them. Adult poverty is often discussed through

the language of work, choice, discipline, productivity, or personal responsibility. Such arguments become morally strained when applied to infants, disabled children, children with chronic illness, or children dependent upon low-income parents. A child does not determine household income, insurance status, nutritional access, neighborhood safety, or proximity to a hospital. The child receives the consequences of adult decisions without possessing adult power.

Children are also developmentally vulnerable. Harm experienced during childhood is not merely a temporary inconvenience. Inadequate nutrition can affect growth and learning. Untreated illness can alter physical development. Loss of therapy can turn a manageable impairment into long-term disability. Housing instability can disrupt schooling and social attachment. War, bereavement, displacement, and chronic fear can shape psychological development for decades. Childhood deprivation is carried into adulthood through health, education, income, relationships, and the ability to care for the next generation.

This paper therefore places American, Israeli, and Palestinian children within the same moral field. Their circumstances differ, but their humanity does not. American children may suffer through medical exclusion, food insecurity, disability-service reductions, parental unemployment, or rural institutional decline. Israeli children may suffer from terrorism, hostage-taking, rocket attacks, displacement, bereavement, and militarized fear. Palestinian children may suffer from bombing, injury, hunger, displacement, destruction of homes and schools, loss of family members, and the prolonged insecurity of occupation and war.

A consistent Christian ethic cannot assign different degrees of innocence according to nationality, ethnicity, religion, or political usefulness. Nor can it defend one child by making another child invisible. The moral question is not which population possesses the more compelling political narrative. It is whether adults are willing to evaluate their governments, alliances, budgets, and theologies by what those systems actually do to children.

Children are especially important within Christianity because they occupy a central place in the teaching of Jesus. They are not presented merely as future adults, family property, national assets, or symbols of innocence. They become examples of humility, recipients of welcome, and objects of severe warnings against harm. A political theology that repeatedly invokes Scripture but reduces the suffering of children to collateral, fiscal, or prophetic necessity must therefore face a direct theological challenge.

1.4 Central thesis

The central argument of this paper is that American evangelical dispensationalism can produce a political and moral hierarchy in which loyalty to the modern State of Israel is elevated above consistent concern for justice, mercy, peace, and vulnerable human life. This hierarchy is sustained by the identification of modern Israel with biblical Israel, the interpretation of

contemporary events through an end-times framework, the treatment of selected biblical promises as directives for American foreign policy, and the incorporation of these beliefs into partisan political identity.

When Israel is understood as an indispensable instrument of prophecy, support for it can cease to function as an ordinary political judgment. It becomes a test of faithfulness. Military assistance may be interpreted as blessing Israel. Diplomatic criticism may be interpreted as opposition to God. Territorial conflict may be interpreted as fulfillment. Escalation may be viewed as confirmation that history is approaching its divinely appointed climax. Under such conditions, evidence that would normally prompt moral reconsideration may instead strengthen the original belief.

The domestic consequences arise through partisan bundling. Support for Israel is joined to positions on abortion, judges, immigration, taxation, public assistance, education, sexuality, and regulation. Once several elements of the package are declared nonnegotiable, the entire platform can receive religious protection. Voters may then support leaders who affirm their theology and cultural identity while reducing programs used by their children, grandchildren, neighbors, churches, and rural communities.

The thesis does not claim that concern for Israel is inherently wrong, that all aid is unjustified, or that every evangelical supporter of Israel is indifferent to children. It argues that unconditional political allegiance to a modern state is not required by Scripture and that such allegiance becomes morally dangerous when it prevents honest scrutiny of policy consequences.

The deepest concern is therefore not simply inconsistency between “America First” and foreign aid. It is the possibility that prophecy has displaced proximity, symbolism has displaced suffering, and political identity has displaced the biblical demand to see and protect vulnerable human beings.

1.5 Scope and necessary distinctions

A responsible analysis must distinguish several categories that are frequently collapsed. Evangelicalism is a broad religious tradition and cannot be reduced to a single political ideology. Many evangelicals reject dispensationalism, criticize Christian Zionism, support social welfare programs, or advocate for Palestinian rights. Dispensationalism itself contains multiple schools, and not all dispensationalists draw identical political conclusions from their theology.

Christian Zionism refers broadly to Christian support for Jewish national restoration or the modern State of Israel, but its motivations vary. Some supporters emphasize biblical prophecy, others historical responsibility after centuries of Christian antisemitism, and others strategic or democratic affinity. Support for Israel may therefore arise from theological, humanitarian,

historical, political, or military reasoning. These motives should not be treated as interchangeable.

The Jewish people must also be distinguished from the modern State of Israel. Judaism is a religious civilization with diverse traditions, communities, and political viewpoints. Jewish identity is not identical to support for every Israeli government. Criticism of an Israeli policy is not inherently criticism of Judaism or hostility toward Jewish people. At the same time, genuine antisemitism remains a serious and persistent danger and must not be minimized or disguised as political analysis.

Biblical Israel, ancient Israelite kingdoms, the Jewish people, and the modern Israeli state are historically related but not simply identical. The theological meaning of covenant cannot be transferred automatically to every institution, boundary, military action, party, or leader of a contemporary nation-state. The Hebrew prophets themselves rejected the idea that covenant eliminated accountability.

Likewise, Palestinians must not be reduced to a single political movement, religious identity, or armed organization. Palestinian society includes Muslims, Christians, secular people, civilians, political factions, refugees, families, workers, and children. Palestinian Christians are particularly important because their presence destabilizes simplified narratives that portray the conflict as a binary struggle between biblical Israel and an undifferentiated hostile world.

Finally, this paper distinguishes support for Israel's right to exist and protect its population from unconditional endorsement of every Israeli policy. It distinguishes strategic alliance from theological obligation, criticism of government from antisemitism, concern for Palestinians from support for terrorism, and child protection from partisan propaganda. These distinctions are necessary because moral blindness often depends upon collapsing complex human realities into rigid categories.

The purpose of the analysis is not to assign collective guilt to evangelicals, Jews, Israelis, Palestinians, conservatives, or any other population. It is to examine a political theology, identify the mechanisms through which it shapes perception, and ask whether its consequences are compatible with the Christian concern for truth, justice, mercy, peace, and children. The argument begins from a simple premise: no modern government should become so sacred that the suffering produced under its protection can no longer be seen.

2. The Historical Construction of Evangelical Christian Zionism

2.1 The emergence of modern dispensationalism

American evangelical attachment to the modern State of Israel did not descend unchanged from the first century of Christianity. It developed through a long history of biblical interpretation, Protestant restorationism, apocalyptic expectation, political nationalism, and modern mass communication. The resulting system is often presented as though it were the obvious meaning of Scripture, but its present form is comparatively recent.

Christian interest in the restoration of the Jewish people predates modern dispensationalism. During the Reformation and post-Reformation periods, some Protestant interpreters rejected the view that the Church had permanently displaced Israel in every theological sense. Puritan and millenarian writers speculated that the Jewish people would experience conversion, restoration, or a renewed historical role before the return of Christ. These ideas appeared in different forms in Britain, continental Europe, and colonial America.

Such restorationist thought was not yet the complete dispensational system that later became influential in American fundamentalism. Earlier interpreters differed over whether restoration meant conversion to Christianity, return to the land, national sovereignty, or participation in a future millennial kingdom. They also differed over whether the Church and Israel remained permanently separate peoples within God's plan.

Modern dispensationalism systematized these expectations. It divided biblical and human history into distinct periods in which God administered his relationship with humanity in different ways. Although the number and definition of the dispensations varied, the system emphasized a distinction between Israel and the Church. Promises made to national Israel, particularly those involving land, kingdom, and restoration, were understood as remaining literally valid and awaiting future fulfillment.

This distinction had far-reaching consequences. If Israel and the Church retained separate prophetic identities, then the Church could not be understood as fully inheriting or spiritually fulfilling Israel's national promises. A future restoration of Jewish national life became necessary to the prophetic system itself. The Jewish return to Palestine was therefore not merely a political possibility. It became an expected stage in sacred history.

Dispensationalism also emerged during an era of rapid social change. Industrialization, urbanization, scientific controversy, biblical criticism, imperial rivalry, and political revolution produced a widespread sense that the traditional social order was under threat. Prophetic systems offered a comprehensive account of instability. Wars, social disruption, religious decline, and political conflict could be interpreted not as meaningless chaos but as signs that history was moving toward a divinely determined conclusion.

The system offered both explanation and certainty. Believers could locate themselves within a prophetic sequence, interpret current events through Scripture, and anticipate Christ's return. Yet the same confidence could narrow moral perception. Once present events were assigned fixed roles in a prophetic timetable, human suffering could become subordinate to the larger narrative. Populations might be understood less as communities of persons and more as prophetic actors whose significance lay in advancing the expected sequence.

2.2 John Nelson Darby and prophetic systematization

John Nelson Darby was the central figure in the formation and international spread of nineteenth-century dispensationalism. Born in 1800, trained in law, and ordained in the Church of Ireland, Darby later became a leading voice among the Plymouth Brethren. He rejected many established ecclesiastical structures and emphasized the spiritual corruption of institutional Christianity.

Darby developed a detailed interpretation of biblical history that sharply distinguished Israel from the Church. Israel was understood as an earthly people associated with national promises, land, law, and kingdom. The Church was understood as a heavenly people whose calling and destiny were distinct. Because the Church had not replaced Israel, God's promises to national Israel awaited literal fulfillment in the future.

This framework included the expectation that the Church would be removed from the earth before an intense period of tribulation. The precise history of the pretribulation rapture doctrine remains debated, and Darby was not the first Christian to expect believers to be gathered to Christ. His importance lies in combining the rapture, the tribulation, the restoration of Israel, and the millennial reign into a coherent prophetic architecture.

Darby traveled extensively throughout Britain, Europe, Canada, and the United States. His American visits during the nineteenth century brought him into contact with ministers, Bible teachers, and religious networks receptive to prophetic interpretation. He did not single-handedly create American dispensationalism, but his system supplied an organizing framework that others adapted and popularized.

Darby's theology was initially associated with relatively small circles of intensive Bible study. Its influence grew because it offered more than isolated predictions. It provided a method for arranging Scripture. Biblical passages concerning Israel, the nations, the Church, judgment, and restoration could be placed within a chronological system that appeared internally consistent.

The intellectual power of the system was also its moral danger. A system that explains every event can become resistant to correction by events. Conflict involving the Jewish people could be interpreted as prophetic confirmation. Their restoration to the land could be interpreted as

fulfillment. Hostility toward them could be understood as the predicted opposition of the nations. War surrounding Jerusalem could be read as movement toward the final crisis.

In this structure, catastrophe did not necessarily disprove the interpretation. Catastrophe could confirm it. The worse conditions became, the more closely they might appear to resemble apocalyptic expectation. This feature would later influence attitudes toward modern Middle Eastern conflict, including the temptation to view escalating violence as theologically meaningful rather than as a human disaster requiring prevention.

2.3 The Scofield Reference Bible

Cyrus Ingerson Scofield played a decisive role in transferring dispensational interpretation from specialized teaching networks into the everyday reading practices of American Protestants. The Scofield Reference Bible, first published in 1909 and revised in 1917, presented the biblical text together with notes, headings, cross-references, and interpretive explanations.

The importance of the Scofield Bible cannot be reduced to its sales. Its format gave theological commentary unusual authority. Readers encountered the biblical text and the dispensational explanation on the same page. For many lay believers, the notes became inseparable from the Scripture they were intended to explain.

Scofield organized biblical history through a sequence of dispensations and reinforced the distinction between Israel and the Church. Prophecies involving land, kingdom, and national restoration were interpreted literally and futuristically. The Church occupied a different divine administration, sometimes described as a parenthetical period within the larger prophetic history concerning Israel.

The influence of Scofield's notes was strengthened by their apparent precision. Complex prophetic passages could be arranged into a sequence involving the Church age, rapture, tribulation, Antichrist, Israel's restoration, Armageddon, Christ's return, and the millennial kingdom. The system transformed scattered passages from Daniel, Ezekiel, Zechariah, the Gospels, Paul's letters, and Revelation into a unified timeline.

This interpretive confidence affected political imagination. If Jewish national restoration was an essential component of prophecy, political events facilitating such restoration could acquire theological importance. Support for Jewish settlement in Palestine could be understood not merely as humanitarian concern or nationalist politics but as cooperation with divine purpose.

The Scofield Bible also helped naturalize a particular reading of Genesis 12:3. The promise to bless those who blessed Abraham was increasingly applied to nations and governments in relation to the Jewish people and, eventually, to the modern State of Israel. Over time, "blessing

Israel" could be translated into diplomatic recognition, military assistance, territorial support, and resistance to political criticism.

Yet Genesis 12:3 does not specify a modern military alliance, an aid package, a territorial policy, or an exemption from moral judgment. The movement from covenantal promise to contemporary state policy required multiple interpretive steps. Scofield's influence helped make those steps feel direct and self-evident.

The long-term consequence was the creation of a large religious constituency whose Bible reading already contained a political map. When the State of Israel was established in 1948, millions of American Christians possessed an interpretive framework ready to receive the event as prophetic confirmation.

2.4 Fundamentalism, prophecy conferences, and mass communication

Dispensationalism spread through more than books. It became embedded in institutions. Bible conferences, revival networks, missionary organizations, Bible institutes, seminaries, radio programs, publishing houses, and independent churches created a durable infrastructure for prophetic teaching.

The Niagara Bible Conference, held during the late nineteenth century, became one important center of conservative Protestant biblical interpretation and premillennial expectation. Participants did not agree on every doctrine, but conferences of this type helped connect pastors and teachers who opposed theological liberalism and emphasized biblical inerrancy, evangelism, and prophecy.

Dwight L. Moody was not a systematic theologian of dispensationalism, but his evangelistic influence and institutional legacy helped create an environment receptive to premillennial teaching. The Moody Bible Institute trained generations of pastors, missionaries, and lay workers. Through education, publishing, and radio, dispensational ideas entered churches far beyond the original Brethren movement.

Arno C. Gaebelein, James H. Brookes, William E. Blackstone, Lewis Sperry Chafer, and later John F. Walvoord were among the figures who developed and disseminated prophetic interpretations centered on Israel's future. Chafer founded Dallas Theological Seminary, which became one of the most influential centers of academic dispensationalism. Walvoord, as theologian and seminary president, extended the system through books addressing prophecy, Israel, the rapture, and global events.

William E. Blackstone is especially relevant to the movement from theology to political advocacy. His 1891 memorial urged American support for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. This was before the establishment of the modern State of Israel and before the Balfour Declaration.

Blackstone's activity demonstrates that Christian restorationist expectations could generate organized political action rather than remaining private speculation.

Radio and print multiplied the audience. Prophecy teaching could be distributed through sermons, pamphlets, devotional materials, newspapers, correspondence courses, and Bible-study charts. Visual timelines gave believers a sense that prophetic history could be mapped with technical accuracy. The future appeared almost diagrammatic.

After the Second World War, television and paperback publishing enlarged the movement further. Hal Lindsey's The Late Great Planet Earth, published in 1970, interpreted contemporary events through dispensational prophecy and reached a mass audience. Lindsey connected the Cold War, European integration, Middle Eastern conflict, nuclear danger, and the State of Israel to an approaching end-times scenario.

Tim LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins later brought similar themes to millions of readers through the Left Behind novels. Although fictional, the series taught a theological system through narrative. Readers encountered the rapture, tribulation, Antichrist, global government, and Israel's prophetic role as dramatic events involving recognizable characters.

Popular culture made dispensationalism emotionally vivid. Prophecy was no longer confined to doctrinal lectures. It became entertainment, suspense, identity, and expectation. This narrative power made alternative interpretations seem not merely mistaken but spiritually dangerous. A person who questioned the system could appear to be denying biblical literalism itself.

2.5 The creation of the modern State of Israel

The establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 was a historical and political event with many causes: Jewish nationalism, European antisemitism, the Holocaust, British imperial policy, international diplomacy, migration, conflict within Mandatory Palestine, and the collapse of older political arrangements. For dispensationalists, however, the event possessed an additional meaning. It appeared to verify a prophetic system developed decades earlier.

The Holocaust gave Jewish statehood extraordinary moral urgency. The destruction of European Jewry demonstrated the catastrophic consequences of statelessness, persecution, and the failure of nations to protect Jewish life. Christian recognition of centuries of antisemitism also contributed to support for Jewish national security.

These humanitarian and historical considerations were frequently joined to prophecy. The gathering of Jewish people in the ancestral land was interpreted through passages from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and other biblical books. The modern state became evidence that God was restoring Israel according to his promises.

The 1967 Arab-Israeli War intensified this interpretation. Israeli control of East Jerusalem, including the Old City, was seen by many prophecy teachers as an event of enormous biblical significance. Jerusalem occupied a central place in prophetic expectation, and Israeli control appeared to move history closer to anticipated end-times events.

The 1973 war, continuing regional conflicts, and disputes over territory reinforced the sense that Israel stood at the center of world history. Each crisis could be fitted into a prophetic framework involving hostile nations, Jerusalem, divine judgment, and the final confrontation.

This interpretation elevated Israel beyond the category of an ordinary state. France, Britain, Turkey, Egypt, or Jordan might be evaluated according to interests, conduct, treaties, and changing governments. Israel, by contrast, could be viewed as a prophetic institution whose existence and actions carried sacred significance.

The distinction between the existence of Israel and the policies of Israeli governments began to erode. Supporting the survival and security of Israeli civilians could become indistinguishable from endorsing territorial expansion, settlement policy, military operations, or the decisions of particular political leaders.

This collapse of distinctions had serious moral effects. Jewish safety is a legitimate and urgent concern. It does not follow that every action undertaken in the name of Israeli security is just, prudent, lawful, or beneficial to Israeli children. A government may endanger its own population through escalation, failed strategy, or disregard for the future. Treating criticism as betrayal can therefore weaken rather than strengthen long-term security.

The same framework marginalized Palestinians. Their displacement, dispossession, national aspirations, civilian suffering, and internal diversity often appeared as secondary obstacles within a story whose outcome had already been determined. Palestinian Christians were particularly disruptive to the simplified narrative because they could not easily be classified as enemies of Christianity or outsiders to the biblical lands.

2.6 From theological expectation to political program

The transformation of Christian Zionism into a political force accelerated during the second half of the twentieth century. Before this period, many conservative Protestants were politically engaged, but others emphasized separation from worldly institutions or concentrated on evangelism. The rise of the religious right brought prophecy, cultural conflict, and electoral organization into a more unified political movement.

Jerry Falwell became one of the most visible figures in this transition. Through the Moral Majority and his media ministry, Falwell helped organize conservative Christians around

abortion, education, sexuality, anticommunism, national defense, and support for Israel. Israel became part of a broader conservative identity rather than an isolated theological concern.

Pat Robertson likewise combined broadcasting, political advocacy, and prophecy-oriented Christianity. His Christian Broadcasting Network helped bring pro-Israel messages into millions of homes. Political candidates recognized that support for Israel could mobilize evangelical voters and signal religious fidelity.

Tim LaHaye helped connect dispensational prophecy with organized conservative politics. In addition to his role in the Left Behind series, he participated in networks that mobilized evangelical voters around cultural and political issues. Prophetic theology and partisan identity increasingly reinforced one another.

John Hagee later became a prominent advocate through Christians United for Israel. His organization built a large national network encouraging Christians to support pro-Israel legislation, attend public events, communicate with elected officials, and view political support for Israel as a biblical responsibility.

This political program extended beyond Israel's existence or basic security. It could include opposition to territorial concessions, support for Israeli control of Jerusalem, resistance to conditioning military aid, defense of settlement expansion, and hostility toward diplomatic pressure on Israeli governments.

The theological claim gave these positions unusual force. A strategic alliance can be reconsidered when circumstances change. A biblical duty cannot. A military program can be audited. A prophetic obligation is not easily subjected to cost-benefit analysis. A government can be criticized. A divinely chosen instrument may appear beyond criticism.

The result was a form of political immunity. Israel-related policy became one of the rare areas in which advocates of limited government, reduced foreign aid, nonintervention, balanced budgets, and national self-prioritization could support extensive and continuing commitments without perceiving a contradiction.

At the same time, domestic programs were assessed through a harsher moral vocabulary. Medicaid could be described as dependency. Nutrition assistance could be described as entitlement. Disability support could be described as fraud-prone. Public health could be described as government overreach. Yet military assistance to Israel could be described as covenant, blessing, duty, and survival.

The contrast was not only fiscal. It reflected two different moral grammars. Poor American families were required to prove need and deservingness. The foreign-policy commitment was

presumed righteous. Children in low-income households became objects of eligibility rules, while support for Israel became an expression of faith.

2.7 The contemporary Christian Zionist network

Contemporary Christian Zionism operates through a broad network rather than a single denomination or organization. Pastors, megachurches, television networks, radio programs, political action committees, lobbying organizations, donors, publishers, tour companies, Bible colleges, social-media personalities, and elected officials all participate in sustaining the movement.

Churches may hold “Stand with Israel” events, host Israeli officials, organize fundraising campaigns, display Israeli flags, or encourage congregants to contact legislators. Religious tours bring American Christians to biblical sites and create emotional connections with the land. These journeys can deepen historical and spiritual understanding, but itineraries may present the region primarily through an Israeli governmental or evangelical prophetic lens. Palestinian communities, including Christian communities, may receive little attention.

Media ministries reinforce this selective geography. Maps, prophecy charts, military analysis, archaeological discoveries, and breaking news are combined into a continuous narrative of fulfillment. Events are interpreted rapidly, often before reliable evidence is available. The question becomes not simply what happened, who was harmed, or what policy would protect civilians, but where the event fits within prophecy.

Political organizations then convert the religious narrative into legislative pressure. Officeholders are praised for recognizing Jerusalem, supporting arms transfers, opposing diplomatic restrictions, or rejecting conditions on aid. Political loyalty is measured through symbolic acts as well as material policy.

Donor networks amplify these priorities. Candidates understand that strong support for Israel can unlock financial support, institutional access, media approval, and church-based mobilization. Dissent may carry political costs, particularly in strongly evangelical constituencies.

The network also polices language. Criticism of Israeli policy may be recast as abandonment of Israel, hostility toward Jews, or resistance to God. Genuine antisemitism makes this rhetorical environment more difficult because the danger is real. Yet the reality of antisemitism does not justify collapsing all criticism into hatred. Such a collapse prevents accountability and ultimately undermines the distinction between a people and a government.

Most importantly, the contemporary network can direct extraordinary moral attention toward Israel while leaving domestic suffering comparatively unexamined. A congregation may receive repeated messages about threats to Israel while hearing little about children losing medical

coverage, disabled families navigating service reductions, rural hospitals closing, or local schools coping with hunger and homelessness.

This does not mean that evangelical churches perform no domestic charity. Many provide food, clothing, emergency assistance, foster care, disaster relief, and support for families. The contradiction lies elsewhere. Christians may generously alleviate individual suffering while voting for policies that reproduce suffering at a scale private charity cannot overcome.

A food pantry cannot replace a national nutrition program. A church benevolence fund cannot finance pediatric surgery, long-term rehabilitation, or neonatal intensive care. A volunteer clinic cannot substitute for a functioning rural hospital. Private compassion may remain sincere while public policy steadily removes the institutions upon which children depend.

The historical construction of evangelical Christian Zionism therefore produced more than a belief about Israel. It created an interpretive and political hierarchy. The modern State of Israel became visible as prophecy, covenant, alliance, and sacred obligation. Vulnerable children at home and abroad could become visible only intermittently, and often only when their suffering supported the preferred narrative.

Understanding this history is essential because the Israel exception is not an eternal or self-evident feature of Christianity. It was built through identifiable teachers, institutions, publications, political movements, and media systems. What has been historically constructed can be historically examined. What has been presented as biblical necessity can be tested against the full witness of Scripture. What has produced blindness can be challenged by restoring the human beings, especially the children, whom the system has taught its followers not to see.

3. Is the Israel Exception Biblical?

3.1 Biblical Israel and the modern State of Israel

The central theological question is whether the modern State of Israel can be identified so directly with biblical Israel that support for its government becomes a binding Christian obligation. Much of evangelical Christian Zionism assumes that the answer is yes. The assumption is often so deeply embedded in preaching, popular prophecy literature, and political rhetoric that the interpretive steps connecting ancient covenantal Israel to a modern nation-state are rarely examined.

Biblical Israel was not merely a political entity. It was a covenant people whose identity included ancestry, worship, law, land, priesthood, kingship, prophetic accountability, and a distinctive vocation among the nations. At different times, Israel existed as a tribal confederation, a united

monarchy, divided kingdoms, conquered populations, exiled communities, a restored province, and a people dispersed throughout the ancient world. The biblical category itself was historically complex.

The modern State of Israel, established in 1948, is a contemporary nation-state operating through elections, political parties, ministries, courts, armed forces, taxation, diplomacy, and international law. Its population includes religious and secular Jews, Muslims, Christians, Druze, immigrants, citizens with different ethnic origins, and people holding widely divergent views about religion, territory, war, peace, and national identity. Its governments change. Its coalitions fracture. Its leaders make prudential, ideological, strategic, and sometimes self-interested decisions like the leaders of every other state.

Historical continuity between the Jewish people and the land of Israel is real and significant. Jewish religious memory, liturgy, identity, and national aspiration cannot be dismissed. The horrors of persecution and the Holocaust also gave Jewish political security an overwhelming urgency. None of this, however, establishes that every institution or policy of the modern state carries covenantal authority.

A modern government cannot automatically inherit the moral immunity that some Christians imagine belonged to biblical Israel. In fact, biblical Israel possessed no such immunity. Kings were judged. Armies were defeated. Priests were condemned. Wealthy landowners were denounced. National pride was exposed as false confidence. The covenant did not turn political action into divine action.

The distinction is therefore essential. The Jewish people may possess profound historical and theological significance without every decision of an Israeli government becoming sacred. Israel may have a legitimate right to exist and protect its citizens without every military strategy being just. A Christian may oppose antisemitism, support Jewish security, and recognize Jewish attachment to the land while still questioning settlements, territorial claims, treatment of civilians, military tactics, legal policies, or the use of American resources.

Without this distinction, theology becomes incapable of political judgment. The state is no longer viewed as a human institution requiring accountability. It becomes an extension of prophecy, and criticism of policy becomes criticism of God.

3.2 Genesis 12:3 and the politics of blessing

Few biblical texts have been more influential in American Christian Zionism than the promise given to Abraham: those who bless him will be blessed, and those who dishonor or curse him will face divine judgment. In popular preaching, this passage is often transferred directly to the modern State of Israel. Nations that support Israel are said to receive divine favor, while nations that criticize or pressure Israel are warned that they invite catastrophe.

This interpretation moves rapidly across several distinct categories. Abraham becomes the Jewish people. The Jewish people become the modern State of Israel. The modern state becomes its current government. Blessing becomes military aid, weapons transfers, diplomatic protection, and support for particular territorial policies. Criticism becomes cursing. Political disagreement becomes spiritual rebellion.

None of these transitions is self-evident.

The promise in Genesis concerns Abraham and the covenantal purposes that would unfold through him. Abraham is told that he will become a great nation and that all the families of the earth will be blessed through him. The promise therefore moves outward toward universal blessing. In Christian interpretation, this promise is ultimately connected to Christ and the extension of blessing to the nations, not merely to the geopolitical protection of a future state.

To bless Abraham cannot simply mean endorsing every action undertaken by his descendants. The biblical narrative itself rejects such reasoning. Descendants of Abraham repeatedly act unjustly, and their actions are judged. Biblical blessing includes moral correction. A prophet who condemns corruption may bless Israel more faithfully than a courtier who flatters the king.

The word blessing also cannot be reduced to military subsidy. A nation might claim to bless Israel through weapons while contributing to policies that increase long-term insecurity, regional hostility, civilian suffering, and intergenerational trauma. Conversely, a government that pressures Israeli leaders toward restraint or negotiation might be acting in the interest of Israeli children and future peace.

Genesis 12:3 is therefore not a blank check. It does not specify an American budget, military alliance, aid level, territorial boundary, or diplomatic position. It does not require unconditional support for a modern government. To use it in that way converts a covenantal promise into a political slogan.

The deeper irony is that the passage culminates in blessing for all peoples. An interpretation that makes the suffering of Palestinian children invisible, treats neighboring populations only as prophetic obstacles, or excuses unjust conduct toward strangers contradicts the universal direction of the promise it claims to defend.

3.3 Covenant did not eliminate accountability

The Hebrew Bible consistently denies that covenantal election exempts Israel from moral judgment. Election creates responsibility. Israel is called to embody justice, faithfulness, holiness, and care for the vulnerable. When it fails, the prophets do not soften their criticism because the nation is chosen. They intensify it.

The prophets condemn rulers who exploit the poor, judges who accept bribes, merchants who manipulate measures, landowners who accumulate property, elites who live in luxury while others suffer, and religious leaders who use worship to conceal injustice. National ceremonies, sacrifices, and claims of divine favor are declared worthless when social cruelty continues.

This pattern is crucial for evaluating the modern Israel exception. If ancient Israel could be condemned for injustice, no contemporary government connected to Israel can claim exemption. The biblical precedent is not unconditional affirmation. It is rigorous internal judgment.

The prophets also reject the idea that military success proves righteousness. Israel's kings often trust armies, fortifications, horses, foreign alliances, and political maneuvering. Prophetic criticism exposes these strategies when they become substitutes for justice and faithfulness. Victory is not automatically validation. Defeat is not automatically proof that the enemy is morally superior. Historical outcomes remain subject to moral interpretation.

Covenantal accountability also extends to treatment of the stranger, the poor, the widow, the orphan, the debtor, and the laborer. Israel's memory of slavery becomes the basis for ethical obligation. Because the people knew oppression, they were commanded not to reproduce it.

A Christian theology that invokes covenant while neglecting these obligations selects privilege without responsibility. It remembers the promise of land but forgets the command to do justice. It emphasizes divine election but minimizes prophetic rebuke. It protects national claims while overlooking vulnerable populations.

The biblical pattern is the opposite. The closer a people claims to stand to God, the greater the demand for truth, mercy, and accountability.

3.4 The prophetic tradition against national immunity

The prophets are sometimes used by dispensationalists primarily as sources of predictions about Israel's restoration, Jerusalem, hostile nations, and final conflict. Yet the prophetic books are not merely forecasts. They are moral indictments of political power.

Isaiah denounces rulers who enact unjust decrees and deprive the vulnerable of justice. Jeremiah confronts false confidence in sacred institutions and warns that possession of the temple does not protect a corrupt society. Amos rejects religious festivals and songs when justice is absent. Micah condemns leaders who build national greatness through violence and exploitation. Ezekiel describes national collapse as the consequence of corruption, bloodshed, idolatry, and neglect of the weak.

These texts undermine the notion that attachment to sacred land or sacred history protects a nation from judgment. The prophets repeatedly challenge leaders who assume that divine promises guarantee political security regardless of conduct.

The prophetic tradition also distinguishes genuine loyalty from flattery. False prophets proclaim peace when there is no peace. They reassure rulers and populations that disaster will not come. True prophets are often accused of disloyalty because they expose danger, injustice, and false confidence.

This distinction has contemporary relevance. Christians who criticize Israeli policy may be described as abandoning Israel. Yet biblical fidelity may require precisely the opposite: refusing to tell a nation that every course of action is righteous, effective, or divinely protected.

Unconditional support can function like false prophecy. It may encourage leaders to believe that they will receive military and diplomatic backing regardless of consequences. It can weaken internal accountability, marginalize dissenting Israeli voices, and reward policies that endanger both Palestinians and Israelis.

The prophetic model of support is therefore not unquestioning affirmation. It is truthful solidarity. It seeks the good of a people by resisting injustice, warning against destructive power, and refusing to confuse national survival with moral innocence.

3.5 Jesus, the Kingdom of God, and national power

The teaching and ministry of Jesus complicate every attempt to turn biblical election into unconditional modern nationalism. Jesus lived within the Jewish people, honored Israel's Scriptures, worshiped in Jewish settings, and spoke of Israel's covenantal history. Yet he did not organize a movement to secure national power through military force or foreign alliance.

First-century Judea was occupied by Rome. Many Jews longed for national restoration, political sovereignty, and liberation from imperial rule. Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom of God, but he repeatedly disrupted expectations that the kingdom would arrive through conventional domination.

He rejected the use of violence to defend his mission. He warned against rulers who exercise power through coercion and instructed his followers to adopt a different model of authority. He commanded love of enemies, mercy, forgiveness, peacemaking, and care for vulnerable people. These teachings do not eliminate the legitimate responsibilities of governments, but they prevent Christians from treating military power as inherently sacred.

Jesus also challenged ethnic and religious boundaries. His parables and encounters repeatedly placed outsiders within the field of divine concern. The neighbor could be a member of a

despised group. Faith could be found beyond expected boundaries. Compassion was not restricted to one nation's deserving members.

This does not erase Israel's place in the biblical story. It does undermine a political theology that makes nationality the final measure of moral worth.

Children occupy a particularly important place in Jesus' teaching. He welcomes them when disciples treat them as interruptions. He uses them as examples of humility and receptivity. He gives severe warnings about causing little ones to stumble or suffer.

A theology that claims loyalty to biblical Israel but becomes indifferent to children harmed by war, hunger, displacement, illness, or austerity must therefore confront the ethical center of Jesus' teaching. The question is not whether children belong to the correct nation. The question is whether adults see them, receive them, and protect them.

The Kingdom of God cannot be reduced to the security agenda of any modern state. Nor can loyalty to Jesus be measured by unconditional support for a government. Christian discipleship requires judgment according to mercy, truth, justice, and the treatment of the vulnerable.

3.6 Paul, Israel, and Gentile humility

Romans 9–11 is central to Christian reflection on Israel. Paul expresses grief for his fellow Israelites, affirms the historical gifts and calling associated with Israel, and warns Gentile believers against arrogance. He compares Gentile Christians to wild branches grafted into a cultivated olive tree and insists that they have no basis for boasting over the natural branches.

These chapters provide a powerful corrective to Christian antisemitism. Christians cannot despise the Jewish people, erase the Jewish roots of Christianity, or imagine that Gentile believers possess grounds for ethnic superiority. The history of Christian persecution of Jews demonstrates the necessity of Paul's warning.

Yet Paul's argument does not establish a political duty to support every future Jewish government. He does not direct the Roman Empire to create, finance, or arm a Jewish state. He does not define military assistance as the fulfillment of Gentile humility. He does not prohibit criticism of Jewish political authorities.

Paul himself criticizes wrongdoing without regard to ethnicity. His moral reasoning does not create separate ethical standards for Jews and Gentiles. He insists that all stand under divine judgment and that partiality has no place in justice.

The distinction between theological humility and geopolitical obedience must therefore be preserved. Christians should approach Jewish history with gratitude and humility. They should

reject antisemitism and acknowledge the violence committed by Christian societies. They should defend Jewish people against persecution.

None of these obligations requires Christians to declare an Israeli government infallible. Indeed, collapsing the Jewish people into the policies of one state can itself be harmful. Jews throughout the world hold diverse political views. Israeli citizens disagree sharply with one another. Treating all Jews as collectively represented by one government erases that diversity and can reinforce the very conflation that antisemitism exploits.

Romans 9–11 calls Gentile Christians away from pride. It does not call them away from moral discernment. Humility should produce careful judgment, concern for all affected populations, and resistance to hatred. It should not produce political silence.

3.7 The absence of a New Testament foreign-policy mandate

The New Testament contains teachings about rulers, citizenship, taxation, violence, peace, justice, neighbor-love, persecution, and the Church's relation to political authority. It does not contain a command requiring future Christian governments to provide financial, military, or diplomatic support to a modern State of Israel.

This absence matters because Christian Zionist political rhetoric often presents such support as though it were explicit. A policy preference may be defended strategically, historically, or morally. It becomes misleading when it is described as a direct biblical command without acknowledging the interpretive construction required to reach it.

The New Testament's political teachings are more general and morally demanding. Governments are expected to restrain wrongdoing and administer justice. Christians are told to pray for rulers, live peaceably where possible, honor legitimate authority, and refuse idolatrous loyalty. The Church is instructed to care for the poor, welcome strangers, protect the vulnerable, and maintain unity across ethnic divisions.

No nation is declared permanently exempt from moral examination. No alliance is made eternally mandatory. No military appropriation is treated as a sacrament.

This does not mean Christians must oppose aid to Israel. A government might decide that such aid serves national security, protects civilians, preserves regional stability, or responds to historical responsibility. Those claims can be debated.

But prudential policy must remain prudential. It should be evaluated according to effectiveness, proportionality, opportunity cost, legality, consequences for civilians, and consistency with other national commitments. It should not be insulated by claims that God has already settled the budgetary question.

The absence of a New Testament mandate also exposes the selective use of government. Some evangelicals argue that the state should not redistribute resources to provide health care, nutrition, or disability support because Christian compassion should remain private and voluntary. Yet the same believers may insist that government use compulsory taxation to fund a foreign military commitment on theological grounds.

The inconsistency is profound. If government must not enact biblical concern for the poor, why must it enact a disputed interpretation of biblical prophecy? If citizens cannot be taxed to support vulnerable children because that would confuse Church and state, why may they be taxed to support a foreign nation because of Genesis or Revelation?

The distinction is political, not biblical. One form of state action has been declared sacred, while another has been declared illegitimate.

3.8 Honor without unconditional political allegiance

A more responsible Christian position begins by rejecting a false choice. Christians do not have to choose between antisemitism and unconditional support for Israeli policy. They can honor the Jewish people without sacralizing a government. They can recognize Jewish historical connection to the land without denying Palestinian history and suffering. They can defend Israeli civilians without treating Palestinian civilians as expendable.

Such a position requires several commitments.

First, antisemitism must be opposed clearly and consistently. Jewish people must not be blamed collectively for the actions of a government. Ancient accusations, conspiracy theories, racial hostility, religious contempt, and political scapegoating must be rejected.

Second, criticism of the State of Israel must be specific and evidence-based. It should identify policies, leaders, laws, military actions, or institutional practices rather than directing hostility toward Jews as a people.

Third, the same moral standards must be applied to all actors. Terrorism, hostage-taking, attacks on civilians, collective punishment, forced displacement, torture, indiscriminate violence, and dehumanization should be condemned regardless of who commits them.

Fourth, concern for Israel's security should include concern for the consequences of policies that may perpetuate conflict. Unconditional military backing may provide short-term freedom of action while worsening long-term danger. A true friend does not merely supply power. A true friend warns against self-destructive uses of power.

Fifth, Palestinian humanity must be made visible. Palestinians are not prophetic scenery. They are families, communities, workers, believers, unbelievers, political actors, and children.

Palestinian Christians belong directly within the Christian moral community, yet they are often absent from American evangelical narratives.

Finally, Christians should distinguish prayer for Israel from endorsement of Israel. Prayer seeks peace, justice, repentance, security, mercy, and human flourishing. Endorsement grants political approval. The two are not identical.

The biblical alternative to the Israel exception is not hostility toward Israel. It is impartial moral concern. It refuses to make one people invisible in order to defend another. It refuses to identify divine purpose with the changing policies of a state. It refuses to place military power beyond judgment.

The biblical witness permits honor, solidarity, prayer, strategic partnership, criticism, accountability, and concern for security. What it does not require is unconditional allegiance.

The Israel exception is therefore not a plain command of Scripture. It is a modern political theology built from selected texts, historical expectations, and contemporary partisan commitments. Because it is constructed, it can be examined. Because it affects war, public spending, and the lives of children, it must be examined.

The decisive question is not whether a policy can be attached to a biblical verse. The question is whether the policy reflects the wider biblical demands of justice, mercy, truth, humility, peacemaking, and care for the vulnerable. When the claimed defense of prophecy makes children harder to see, the interpretation has failed the moral test of the Scripture it invokes.

4. The Israel Exception to “America First”

4.1 “America First” as a political rather than biblical doctrine

“America First” is a political doctrine, not a biblical command. It expresses the view that the United States should place the security, prosperity, sovereignty, and welfare of its own citizens above the interests of foreign governments, international institutions, and transnational commitments. Depending on how it is defined, the doctrine may include skepticism toward foreign aid, resistance to prolonged wars, tighter border enforcement, reduced participation in multinational institutions, protection of domestic industry, and opposition to nation-building abroad.

Christians may support some or all of these positions as matters of political judgment. They may argue that governments have a special responsibility toward their own citizens, just as parents have special obligations toward their own children. They may also contend that a state

incapable of protecting its own population cannot responsibly address every problem in the world.

Yet Christianity does not teach that national self-interest is the highest moral good. The biblical commands to love one's neighbor, welcome the stranger, seek justice, practice mercy, and pursue peace transcend national boundaries. Christian ethics cannot be reduced either to global humanitarianism or to absolute nationalism. It requires consideration of both particular obligations and universal human worth.

The central problem arises when "America First" is applied selectively. Foreign assistance to poor countries may be dismissed as wasteful. Refugee resettlement may be portrayed as an unacceptable burden. International health programs may be cut because domestic needs should supposedly come first. Military intervention may be condemned as reckless entanglement. Yet when Israel is involved, these objections can disappear.

The exception reveals that "America First" often does not operate as a consistent principle. It functions as a flexible political slogan whose limits are determined by coalition priorities. Israel is treated not as one foreign country among others but as a specially protected state whose claims override the normal restrictions placed upon international commitments.

There is no biblical rule requiring this exemption. The Bible does not instruct the United States to adopt an America First philosophy and then suspend it for Israel. Nor does it authorize Christians to portray a disputed foreign-policy arrangement as a divine exception to their own declared political principles.

This inconsistency matters because political slogans shape public consent. Voters may accept reductions in domestic services on the grounds that government must focus on its own citizens, while simultaneously supporting extensive resources for a foreign state. The contradiction becomes especially severe when the domestic reductions affect children, poor families, disabled people, rural hospitals, or access to medical care.

A defensible policy must therefore state its real principle. If the principle is that the United States should support Israel for strategic reasons, then the strategic case should be made openly. If the principle is that the United States has historical obligations arising from the Holocaust and centuries of antisemitism, then those obligations should be carefully defined. If the principle is theological, then its biblical basis should be examined rather than assumed.

The problem begins when political judgment is disguised as divine necessity.

4.2 Opposition to foreign aid with one protected exception

Opposition to foreign aid has long been part of American conservative rhetoric. Aid is frequently criticized as wasteful, corrupting, ineffective, or unrelated to direct national interests. Voters are

told that American money should not support distant populations while citizens struggle with health care, housing, education, infrastructure, addiction, or economic insecurity.

This argument can be reasonable in particular cases. Foreign-aid programs should be audited. They should have clear purposes, measurable outcomes, and safeguards against corruption. No country is entitled to unlimited American support simply because an assistance program already exists.

Yet Israel is often excluded from this skepticism. Aid to other countries is called charity, dependency, or waste. Aid to Israel is called alliance, obligation, security, or biblical duty. The distinction may be justified in part by strategic considerations, but the rhetorical asymmetry is striking.

The same voter who objects to financing vaccination programs, food relief, or economic development abroad may support billions of dollars in military assistance to Israel without demanding comparable scrutiny. The same political leader who denounces foreign aid generally may insist that support for Israel remain guaranteed and protected from broader spending reductions.

This is not simply a matter of amount. It is a matter of moral classification. Assistance to poor populations is framed as generosity that the United States may withdraw. Assistance to Israel is framed as an obligation whose withdrawal would constitute betrayal.

The difference becomes more revealing when domestic austerity is imposed. Medicaid, nutrition support, child care, rehabilitation, public health, and disability services are often described as financially unsustainable. Recipients must prove need, complete paperwork, meet work conditions, or survive periodic eligibility reviews. Benefits can be reduced because they are classified as optional.

Foreign military assistance to Israel, by contrast, may be treated as structurally permanent. Its continuation is not always tied to equivalent requirements concerning civilian protection, diplomatic cooperation, long-term strategy, or the consequences of military operations.

This creates a disturbing hierarchy. A poor American child's access to therapy may depend upon state appropriations and administrative classifications. A foreign military commitment may be presumed untouchable because political and theological forces protect it.

The argument is not that every dollar spent abroad must instead be spent domestically. National budgets do not operate through a simple one-for-one exchange. The argument is that public language reveals priorities. When leaders claim that there is insufficient money for children's health while refusing even to debate favored military commitments, they expose which expenditures are protected and which lives are negotiable.

The Israel exception therefore challenges the credibility of generalized opposition to foreign aid. If foreign assistance is objectionable because government should prioritize Americans, then Israel requires a clearly articulated justification. If the answer is biblical prophecy, the claim must be treated as theology rather than concealed within strategic rhetoric.

4.3 Opposition to military entanglement with one protected exception

"America First" is also associated with resistance to prolonged military intervention. Its advocates often point to failed wars, nation-building efforts, intelligence errors, regional destabilization, casualties, debt, and the diversion of attention from domestic needs. They argue that the United States should avoid becoming the security guarantor for every ally or participant in every regional dispute.

This skepticism has considerable force. Modern military interventions frequently produce consequences their planners did not foresee. Limited operations can expand. Alliances can create obligations that outlast their original rationale. Weapons supplied for one purpose can contribute to escalation or civilian harm. Governments may take greater risks when they believe a powerful sponsor will protect them from consequences.

Yet military commitments connected to Israel are often insulated from the same warnings. Support is presented as essential even when it increases the risk of American involvement in a wider regional conflict. Political leaders who criticize intervention elsewhere may endorse weapons transfers, deployments, intelligence cooperation, and diplomatic commitments connected to Israel without acknowledging the contradiction.

The issue is not whether Israel faces genuine threats. It does. Israeli civilians have experienced terrorism, hostage-taking, rocket fire, war, and persistent insecurity. A state has a legitimate obligation to defend its population.

The question is whether American support should be unlimited, automatic, and detached from strategic accountability. An alliance is not strengthened when one partner is encouraged to assume that assistance will continue regardless of policy. Such a relationship can produce moral hazard: the protected state may undertake actions it would evaluate differently if support were uncertain.

Unconditional backing may also entangle the United States in conflicts driven partly by another government's political calculations. American citizens, military personnel, taxpayers, and children inherit the risks of escalation without exercising direct control over the decisions that create them.

A consistent noninterventionist position would ask several questions. Does a proposed action directly protect the United States? Does it reduce or increase the likelihood of a wider war? Are

the objectives clear and achievable? Is the support temporary or open-ended? What conditions govern the use of American weapons? What responsibility does the recipient bear for civilian protection and diplomatic alternatives?

The Israel exception often suppresses these questions by treating them as signs of disloyalty. Once support is sacralized, strategic caution can be portrayed as moral weakness. A policy that should be evaluated through evidence becomes protected through religious identity.

This is especially dangerous in an apocalyptic framework. If regional conflict is interpreted as movement toward prophetic fulfillment, escalation may not be perceived solely as failure. It may acquire theological significance. The believer can condemn war in principle while emotionally interpreting its expansion as confirmation that Scripture is unfolding.

The result is a foreign-policy posture in which the normal fear of entanglement is replaced by expectation, and caution is weakened by prophecy.

4.4 Borders, sovereignty, and selective nationalism

Borders and sovereignty occupy a central place in America First politics. Advocates argue that a nation must control entry, enforce its laws, prevent unauthorized migration, and protect its territory. They often reject criticism from international organizations and resist external interference in domestic affairs.

Yet these same principles are applied differently when Israel is involved. Israel's borders, territorial security, military capacity, and national sovereignty are treated as matters of exceptional importance. American resources may be used to strengthen them, while domestic infrastructure and social programs are subjected to restraint.

This creates a selective nationalism. The United States is told that it cannot afford to provide health care or social support to certain residents because national resources are limited. At the same time, it is told that financing another country's military and border security is an unquestionable obligation.

The contradiction is not resolved by saying that Israel is an ally. Allies can receive support without becoming exempt from scrutiny. The deeper issue is why the sovereignty of one foreign state is treated as sacred while the human needs of American citizens are treated as discretionary.

Selective sovereignty also appears in attitudes toward international law. America First rhetoric often rejects international institutions when they challenge United States policy. Similar objections are raised when international bodies investigate or criticize Israel. National sovereignty becomes a shield against external judgment.

Yet sovereignty cannot mean moral immunity. Every state possesses obligations toward civilians, minorities, prisoners, neighboring populations, and people living under its effective control. No nation may invoke security to eliminate all scrutiny of its conduct.

The same principle applies to the United States. A Christian political ethic cannot defend sovereignty only when it protects favored nations. It must ask what sovereignty is for. If national power exists to protect life, preserve justice, and sustain social order, then the welfare of children should stand near its center.

A government that secures distant military interests while allowing children to lose health care, food, therapy, or stable housing has adopted a distorted understanding of national protection. It defends territory while neglecting persons.

Borders matter, but they do not determine the boundaries of moral concern. Nor do they justify evaluating children differently according to which side of a line they were born on. An Israeli child, a Palestinian child, and an American child possess equal human worth even though governments have different legal duties toward them.

Selective nationalism becomes blindness when borders are used to intensify concern for one population while extinguishing concern for another.

4.5 Strategic arguments versus biblical claims

A clear distinction must be maintained between strategic arguments for supporting Israel and biblical claims that such support is commanded by God.

Strategic arguments are open to public evaluation. Advocates may contend that Israel provides intelligence cooperation, military technology, regional deterrence, research partnerships, or a stable alliance in an unstable region. They may argue that the relationship advances American interests and protects shared security objectives.

These claims may be persuasive, partly persuasive, outdated, exaggerated, or mistaken. They can be tested against evidence. Costs can be compared with benefits. Alternatives can be examined. Policies can change as circumstances change.

A biblical claim operates differently. It asserts that the fundamental issue has already been settled by divine authority. If support for Israel is required by covenant or prophecy, then strategic evidence becomes secondary. Even a policy that appears costly, destabilizing, or ineffective may be defended as obedience.

The mixing of these two forms of argument creates confusion. Political leaders may use strategic language in secular settings and biblical language in evangelical settings. The policy gains authority from both domains while avoiding full accountability in either.

When challenged strategically, supporters may appeal to Scripture. When challenged theologically, they may appeal to national security. The policy becomes difficult to examine because its justification shifts according to the audience.

A more honest debate would require advocates to identify which claims are theological and which are strategic. Christians are free to believe that Israel retains a special place in divine history. That belief does not automatically dictate the size, duration, or conditions of an American military program.

Likewise, a person may support Israel strategically without adopting dispensationalism. The alliance should then be defended through ordinary political reasoning rather than sanctified through prophecy.

This distinction protects both theology and democracy. It prevents the state from using disputed religious interpretations as unquestionable policy commands. It also prevents Scripture from being reduced to an instrument of lobbying.

The most important question is not whether some biblical text can be associated with Israel. It is whether that text provides a specific mandate for the proposed action. Scripture does not identify a particular weapons system, aid level, military operation, settlement boundary, or diplomatic veto.

These are human decisions. They should be acknowledged as such.

4.6 The problem of permanent exemption

No foreign alliance should be permanent in the sense of being immune from reconsideration. Alliances may endure for generations, but their terms, purposes, and consequences must remain subject to democratic review.

The Israel exception undermines this principle. Support can become so deeply embedded in religious identity, party loyalty, donor networks, and political institutions that ordinary review becomes nearly impossible. Legislators may fear electoral punishment for asking questions that would be routine in relation to another country.

Permanent exemption creates several dangers.

First, it weakens accountability. A government confident of continuing support has less incentive to respond to criticism, change harmful policies, or pursue diplomatic alternatives.

Second, it limits democratic deliberation. Citizens may be told that debate itself is dangerous, antisemitic, disloyal, or contrary to Scripture. Genuine antisemitism must be confronted, but accusations of hatred must not be used to prevent legitimate scrutiny of government action.

Third, permanent exemption damages the ally it claims to protect. Policies that create long-term insecurity, deepen hostility, or traumatize another generation may continue because outside supporters reward short-term force without considering future consequences.

Fourth, it distorts domestic priorities. Protected foreign commitments become disconnected from debates over health, education, infrastructure, debt, and children's welfare. Political leaders can claim scarcity when discussing domestic needs while treating the protected alliance as outside the field of scarcity.

Fifth, sacred exemption encourages moral inconsistency. Conduct condemned when performed by an adversary may be excused when performed by the favored state. Civilian deaths may be personalized on one side and abstracted on the other. Children may be mourned or ignored according to their nationality.

A democratic alliance should be conditional in the broadest moral sense. It should depend upon shared interests, lawful conduct, responsible use of assistance, protection of civilians, transparency, and willingness to pursue durable peace.

Conditionality is not betrayal. It is the ordinary structure of accountable relationships. Parents set conditions for children, institutions set conditions for employees, governments set conditions for recipients, and allies set conditions for one another. Only a sacralized relationship is treated as though conditions themselves were immoral.

The Israel exception is therefore not merely an inconsistency within America First politics. It is a deeper failure to separate faith from state policy, covenant from government, people from rulers, security from impunity, and alliance from worship.

Its most serious consequence is not rhetorical contradiction. It is the reordering of moral attention. A foreign government becomes permanently visible as sacred and threatened. Children harmed by domestic austerity or regional war become intermittently visible, politically inconvenient, or absent.

The corrective is not hostility toward Israel. It is the restoration of proportion, accountability, and equal human worth. Israel should be defended where defense is just, criticized where criticism is warranted, assisted where assistance advances peace and security, and restrained where power becomes destructive.

The United States should be judged by the same standard. No slogan, nation, party, or alliance should be permitted to stand above the lives of children.

5. The Mechanisms of Dispensationalist Blindness

5.1 Prophecy over proximity

Moral attention is not distributed evenly. People tend to respond most strongly to suffering that is made visible, emotionally vivid, and spiritually significant. Dispensationalist politics can reorganize this natural pattern by giving distant geopolitical events greater religious importance than nearby human need.

Israel is frequently presented to evangelical audiences through the language of covenant, prophecy, divine election, biblical fulfillment, and the return of Christ. News from Jerusalem is not received simply as foreign news. It may be interpreted as movement within sacred history. Events involving Israeli territory, military conflict, regional hostility, or diplomatic recognition can therefore acquire a significance far beyond their immediate political meaning.

By contrast, the suffering of a child in Missouri, Kansas, Tennessee, or rural Texas may appear administratively ordinary. A child loses access to therapy because a service is reclassified. A family loses food assistance because eligibility rules change. A hospital closes a pediatric unit because reimbursements are inadequate. A disabled child remains on a waiting list because appropriations are insufficient. None of these events carries the dramatic language of prophecy. They arrive quietly, dispersed across agencies, households, and budgets.

The result is a reversal of moral proximity. The child nearby is physically close but symbolically distant. The foreign state is geographically distant but symbolically near.

This reversal does not require conscious indifference. A believer may care deeply about neighbors and still fail to connect political choices with local harm. The local consequences are fragmented and technically described, while the distant commitment is unified by a compelling story. Prophecy provides narrative coherence. Domestic austerity provides forms, denials, waiting periods, reimbursement codes, and statistics.

A person is more likely to defend what has been given sacred meaning than what has been rendered administratively invisible.

The phrase prophecy over proximity describes this hierarchy. It does not mean that Christians should care only about people geographically near them. Christian ethics reaches beyond borders. The problem is that spiritual attention may be directed toward a nation-state while the needs of actual human beings, both nearby and abroad, become subordinate to that state's prophetic role.

The child is no longer encountered first as a child. The child is encountered through political classification. An Israeli child may appear as evidence of threatened civilization. A Palestinian child may appear as part of a hostile population. An American child receiving Medicaid may

appear as part of an entitlement program. These classifications shape moral response before the individual child is fully seen.

The Christian command to love the neighbor is therefore weakened not by physical distance alone but by narrative distance. A prophetic system can make one population permanently near and another permanently remote.

5.2 Selective biblical literalism

Dispensationalist political reasoning often depends upon a selective form of literalism. Passages concerning Israel, land, covenant, blessing, restoration, Jerusalem, and the nations are treated as direct political instructions. Passages concerning the poor, the sick, the stranger, the widow, the orphan, the debtor, and the child are often redirected into the private sphere.

The distinction is striking. “Bless Israel” is interpreted as a governmental obligation. “Care for the poor” is interpreted as an individual or church responsibility. One biblical theme is translated into foreign policy, military appropriations, and diplomatic alignment. The other is prevented from informing public institutions because government involvement is said to produce dependency, coercion, or inefficiency.

This is not a consistent doctrine of limited government. It is a selective decision about which biblical concerns government may enact.

The same state that is considered spiritually unfit to provide medical care for a poor child is considered spiritually obligated to finance military support for a foreign nation. Compulsory taxation is rejected when it supports social welfare but accepted when it supports a theological interpretation of Israel.

Selective literalism also operates through emphasis. Certain biblical texts are repeated until they become central to political identity. Genesis 12, Ezekiel’s restoration imagery, prophetic references to Jerusalem, and passages associated with end-times conflict may receive constant attention. Biblical material concerning economic justice, dishonest scales, exploitation, indebtedness, treatment of foreigners, or condemnation of powerful rulers receives less political application.

The problem is not that the Israel-related passages are irrelevant. It is that they are separated from the wider moral witness of Scripture. The result is a theology of promise without accountability, election without justice, land without neighbor-love, and prophecy without children.

Literalism becomes especially selective when contemporary political categories are inserted into ancient texts. A modern secular state, its current borders, governing coalition, military strategy, and alliance with the United States may be treated as though each were explicitly named in

Scripture. At the same time, clear commands concerning mercy and protection of the vulnerable are treated as too general to inform policy.

The interpretive standard changes according to the desired outcome. Prophetic language is made politically concrete. Ethical language is made politically abstract.

This selectivity helps maintain blindness because it gives believers a biblical defense against uncomfortable evidence. When domestic policies cause hardship, responsibility can be shifted to family, church, charity, or personal discipline. When foreign policy toward Israel is questioned, the issue can be elevated to divine obedience.

The result is not biblical consistency but theological asymmetry.

5.3 Partisan bundling

Most voters do not select policies individually. Political parties assemble multiple positions into a single package. A voter who chooses a candidate because of abortion may also support that candidate's positions on taxation, Medicaid, foreign aid, immigration, regulation, labor, education, and war, even when those positions have received little independent examination.

For many conservative evangelicals, support for Israel is part of a larger partisan bundle. It may be joined to opposition to abortion, resistance to changing sexual norms, support for conservative judges, gun rights, immigration enforcement, school policy, religious-liberty claims, and hostility toward secular institutions.

Once several issues within the bundle are declared morally absolute, the entire package can become protected from scrutiny.

A voter may strongly oppose abortion and therefore support a party whose economic policies reduce prenatal care, maternal coverage, child nutrition, pediatric services, and disability assistance. The contradiction may not be experienced as contradiction because abortion occupies a sacred category while the other policies are treated as technical matters.

The same process applies to Israel. Support for Israel becomes a signal that a candidate belongs to the correct moral coalition. Once that trust is established, the candidate receives credibility on unrelated issues. The voter may assume that a leader who stands with Israel and speaks the language of faith will also act justly toward American families, even when the policy record suggests otherwise.

Partisan bundling compresses moral judgment. Instead of evaluating each issue according to evidence and consequence, the voter accepts a package organized by identity.

The bundle is also reinforced negatively. The opposing party is associated with secularism, abortion, gender politics, hostility toward Christianity, or insufficient support for Israel. Rejecting the bundle may therefore feel like rejecting faith itself.

This dynamic helps explain why material self-harm can coexist with intense political loyalty. The voter is not necessarily choosing lower medical access or weaker social protection. The voter is choosing membership in a moral coalition. The harmful policies arrive as attached provisions.

Children are especially vulnerable to this mechanism because their interests are rarely represented as sacred issues within the bundle. They appear indirectly through health, food, housing, education, disability, and family income. These programs are administratively complex and politically fragmented. They cannot compete easily with emotionally concentrated issues such as abortion, Israel, or cultural identity.

The party therefore receives moral authority from a few highly visible commitments while implementing a much broader agenda.

5.4 Sacred issues and automatic political consent

A sacred issue is one that becomes exempt from ordinary compromise, proportionality, cost analysis, or empirical evaluation. It is no longer treated as one political concern among many. It becomes a test of moral identity.

Israel can function in this way within evangelical politics. A candidate's position may be judged not by the details of policy but by whether the candidate is described as standing with Israel. Ceremonial gestures, speeches, embassy decisions, visits, flags, and public declarations can carry enormous symbolic weight.

Sacred issues create shortcuts in political reasoning. Once a leader is trusted on the sacred question, that trust can spill over into unrelated domains. The leader may be assumed to be pro-family, pro-life, patriotic, and Christian, even if specific policies weaken families, increase medical insecurity, or expose children to avoidable hardship.

Automatic consent is not complete ignorance. It is delegated judgment. Voters entrust political interpretation to pastors, media figures, advocacy groups, party leaders, and religious organizations. These authorities identify the faithful position, and the believer accepts the broader consequences.

This delegation can be psychologically comforting. Modern policy is complex. Few citizens have time to evaluate every appropriations bill, reimbursement rule, military transfer, eligibility standard, or administrative waiver. Trusted authorities reduce complexity by providing a moral map.

The danger arises when the map is organized around symbols rather than outcomes. Leaders can preserve loyalty by affirming sacred issues while harming the material conditions of their supporters.

The voter may lose local medical access yet continue to regard the responsible politicians as defenders of Christian values. The contradiction is resolved symbolically: earthly hardship becomes secondary to spiritual faithfulness.

This process is especially powerful when dissent is morally stigmatized. Questioning aid may be called abandonment. Criticizing Israeli policy may be called antisemitism. Supporting public assistance may be called socialism. Raising concern about civilian casualties may be called support for terrorism.

The available moral vocabulary narrows until only one position appears faithful.

Automatic political consent follows not because voters are incapable of judgment but because the framework has preclassified the alternatives.

5.5 The pastor–media–politician feedback loop

Dispensationalist political blindness is not generated by one source. It is reinforced through a network of mutually validating institutions.

Pastors may preach that Israel occupies a unique role in God's prophetic plan. Religious broadcasters may interpret current events through end-times expectations. Advocacy groups may translate those interpretations into legislative priorities. Politicians may repeat biblical language in churches and public speeches. Media outlets may present those politicians as defenders of faith. The cycle then returns to the congregation with greater authority.

Each participant validates the others.

The pastor cites political developments as evidence that prophecy is unfolding. The broadcaster features the politician who promises unconditional support. The politician praises the church for moral clarity. The advocacy group reports the politician's statements as proof of success. Donors reward the alignment. Congregants receive a unified message from multiple trusted sources.

The effect is not merely persuasion. It creates an interpretive environment in which alternative views appear marginal or dangerous.

A church member may rarely encounter Palestinian Christians, Israeli peace advocates, Jewish critics of government policy, military analysts who question strategy, or theologians who reject dispensationalism. The information environment is curated by ideological compatibility.

Domestic policy receives a different treatment. Medicaid regulations, food-benefit rules, rural hospital finance, special-education funding, and disability waivers are rarely the subject of prophecy conferences or religious television. These matters lack drama and theological symbolism.

Politicians therefore gain greater religious credit from a speech about Jerusalem than from preserving pediatric coverage. A pastor may mobilize a congregation around an embassy decision while remaining silent about a local hospital closure. A broadcaster may devote hours to prophetic conflict while giving little attention to children losing therapy.

The feedback loop determines not only what believers think but what they notice.

It also protects leaders from accountability. When a politician is presented as an instrument of divine purpose, criticism can be interpreted as hostility toward the faith. The leader's symbolic actions outweigh policy outcomes.

The loop is especially powerful because it combines spiritual authority with political messaging. Congregants may trust a pastor on Scripture and therefore accept the pastor's political conclusions. The distinction between biblical teaching and partisan interpretation becomes blurred.

Over time, a historically constructed policy position can feel like a timeless element of Christianity.

5.6 Eschatological unfalsifiability

A political belief is difficult to correct when every possible outcome confirms it. Dispensationalist prophecy can function in this manner.

If Israel prospers, the prosperity may be interpreted as divine blessing. If Israel is attacked, the attack may be interpreted as fulfillment of prophecy concerning hostile nations. If conflict expands, the expansion may be interpreted as movement toward the final confrontation. If peace negotiations fail, the failure may be taken as proof that human diplomacy cannot overcome God's timetable. If international criticism increases, it may be interpreted as the predicted gathering of the nations against Israel.

No event necessarily disconfirms the framework.

This unfalsifiability weakens political learning. In ordinary policy analysis, harmful consequences should prompt reevaluation. A strategy that increases danger, civilian death, regional instability, or hostility should be reconsidered. In an eschatological framework, the same consequences may strengthen belief.

Escalation becomes evidence.

This creates a serious moral hazard. A believer may emotionally welcome signs of prophetic fulfillment even while consciously grieving the suffering involved. The conflict acquires a second meaning. It is both tragedy and confirmation.

Children are especially endangered by this interpretive structure because their suffering can be absorbed into the narrative. Their deaths, injuries, displacement, fear, and hunger become part of the anticipated turmoil preceding divine resolution.

A theology of inevitable catastrophe can reduce urgency for prevention. Why pursue durable peace if war is foretold? Why challenge policies that intensify conflict if conflict confirms the prophetic sequence? Why invest deeply in long-term coexistence if history is nearing its end?

Not every dispensationalist draws these conclusions. Many sincerely seek peace and humanitarian relief. The danger lies in the structure of the system. It can make failure spiritually meaningful.

When a political theology cannot be corrected by suffering, it becomes insulated from one of the most important forms of moral evidence.

5.7 Apocalyptic expectation and diminished prevention

Public policy depends upon prevention. Governments invest in vaccination before epidemics, rehabilitation before disability worsens, diplomacy before war expands, nutrition before developmental harm occurs, and infrastructure before systems collapse.

Apocalyptic expectation can weaken this preventive imagination. If history is understood as moving inevitably toward catastrophe, long-term investment may appear secondary. Environmental decline, regional instability, political polarization, and military escalation can be interpreted as signs rather than preventable failures.

The believer may still support practical action, but the emotional horizon has changed. The future belongs to divine intervention rather than human stewardship.

This can affect domestic policy. Programs for children often require patient, long-term investment. Early nutrition, preventive health care, special education, therapy, safe housing, and maternal care produce benefits over years or generations. They are easy to cut when politics is organized around immediate symbolic victories.

Apocalyptic politics favors spectacle over maintenance. Embassy moves, declarations, military actions, and public confrontations are visible. Preventive care is quiet. Its success consists in harms that never occur.

The same applies to peace. Diplomacy is slow, compromised, and often unsatisfying. It requires seeing adversaries as future participants in coexistence. A prophetic framework that assigns nations fixed roles in an approaching conflict can make such work appear naive.

Children inherit the consequences. They receive the debt of neglected systems, untreated trauma, deteriorating institutions, and unresolved war.

A child-centered ethic requires the opposite temporal orientation. It asks what conditions adults are constructing for people who will live after current leaders, parties, and prophetic predictions have passed.

Prevention is an act of faith in the future. Apocalyptic certainty can become an excuse for abandoning it.

5.8 Moral disengagement through sacred narrative

Most people do not want to think of themselves as supporting harm. Moral disengagement allows them to accept harmful outcomes without experiencing themselves as cruel.

Sacred narrative is one of the most powerful mechanisms of disengagement. It places troubling actions within a story of divine purpose, national survival, righteous struggle, or unavoidable necessity. Once the larger story is accepted, individual suffering can be reclassified.

Civilian deaths become collateral damage. Hunger becomes the responsibility of enemy leaders. Domestic deprivation becomes the result of dependency. Lost medical care becomes fiscal discipline. Disability becomes a family responsibility. Displacement becomes a security requirement.

Language separates the policy from the person.

Sacred narrative also redistributes blame. The favored side acts because it must. The disfavored population suffers because of its leaders, culture, choices, or moral failures. The believer retains compassion in principle while transferring responsibility away from the institutions being defended.

This process works domestically as well as internationally. A family that loses assistance may be blamed for relying on government. A parent who cannot secure therapy may be told that churches and communities should help. A child's need is acknowledged, but the policy producing the need remains morally protected.

Private charity can then function as a substitute for public accountability. The believer gives food, donates money, or supports a ministry and therefore experiences genuine compassion. Yet the broader political structure that produces recurring need is not examined.

Moral disengagement does not eliminate kindness. It compartmentalizes it.

The most dangerous form of blindness is therefore not hatred. It is compassion that never reaches the policy level.

A person may love children personally while supporting systems that harm children impersonally. The distance between personal intention and institutional consequence protects the moral self-image.

The sacred narrative completes the separation. The believer is not supporting austerity, war, or displacement. The believer is defending freedom, resisting evil, blessing Israel, protecting taxpayers, or preserving biblical values.

The moral description of the action replaces its human outcome.

The mechanisms examined in this section reinforce one another. Prophecy creates sacred visibility. Selective literalism supplies biblical authority. Partisan bundling transfers that authority to a wider political platform. Sacred issues produce automatic consent. Pastors, media, advocates, and politicians repeat the message. Eschatological interpretation prevents contrary outcomes from correcting the belief. Apocalyptic expectation weakens prevention. Sacred narrative protects the believer from confronting the harm.

Together, these mechanisms explain how compassionate people can participate in political systems that make children disappear.

The blindness is not accidental. It is structured.

For that reason, correction requires more than presenting isolated facts. It requires changing the moral frame through which facts are received. Children must be restored to visibility before they are classified by nationality, entitlement status, religion, or prophetic role.

The central question must become not whether a policy affirms the correct symbol, party, alliance, or eschatological interpretation, but what the policy foreseeably does to living children.

Until that question becomes primary, blindness will continue to reproduce itself under the name of faithfulness.

6. Domestic Austerity and the Evangelical Communities It Harms

6.1 Medicaid and restricted medical access

Domestic austerity is often presented as an abstract exercise in fiscal discipline. Legislators speak of controlling expenditures, eliminating optional benefits, increasing efficiency,

preventing fraud, and preserving programs for those who are considered truly needy. The language suggests technical management rather than moral choice. Yet every reduction in eligibility, reimbursement, coverage, or administrative accessibility is ultimately experienced by a person.

Medicaid is especially vulnerable because it serves populations with limited political power. Its beneficiaries include children, pregnant women, disabled people, low-income workers, nursing-home residents, and adults whose illnesses interfere with stable employment. Many cannot purchase equivalent private coverage. When benefits are reduced, they do not simply move to another insurance plan. They postpone care, rely on emergency departments, accumulate debt, go without therapy, or depend more heavily upon relatives.

Children are deeply affected even when a policy is nominally directed at adults. A parent who loses treatment may become less able to work, drive, prepare meals, supervise children, or maintain stable housing. A grandparent whose mobility deteriorates may no longer be able to provide child care. A disabled adult whose services are reduced may require another family member to leave employment. The effect spreads through the household.

The political rhetoric surrounding Medicaid frequently separates beneficiaries into deserving and undeserving categories. Children and disabled people are usually described as deserving, while working-age adults are treated with greater suspicion. In practice, families do not divide so neatly. Adults care for children. Children depend upon adult health. A policy that harms a parent cannot be isolated from the child living in the same home.

Evangelical communities are not outside this system. Many churches are located in rural counties, small towns, deindustrialized regions, and low-income suburbs where Medicaid plays a major role in sustaining hospitals, clinics, pharmacies, nursing facilities, and therapy practices. Congregants may publicly oppose government assistance while privately relying upon the medical infrastructure that public insurance supports.

This dependence is often hidden because people think of health programs as benefits received by someone else. They may associate Medicaid with urban poverty or political stereotypes rather than with their own grandchildren, disabled church members, nursing-home residents, low-wage workers, and local hospital.

A reimbursement cut can therefore harm people who supported the officials responsible for it. Yet because the policy arrives through agency notices and provider decisions rather than a direct announcement of injury, the causal connection remains difficult to see.

6.2 Missouri's chronic-pain policy as a case study

Missouri's decision to remove physical therapy, acupuncture, and chiropractic treatment from a chronic-pain alternative-therapy program illustrates how austerity can contradict the stated goals of health policy.

The program was designed to provide non-opioid approaches for people with chronic pain. Such patients may need more than medication. They may require movement therapy, strengthening, mobility training, pain-management education, or other interventions intended to preserve function and reduce reliance upon drugs.

When these services are eliminated from a public program, the policy may be described as a limited benefit adjustment. For the patient, however, the change is not semantic. It may mean the difference between receiving treatment and receiving none.

Physical therapy is especially important because it cannot reasonably be dismissed as merely an unconventional preference. It is a conventional part of rehabilitation medicine. It is used after injury, surgery, stroke, neurological illness, musculoskeletal disease, and prolonged immobility. It can help preserve balance, strength, range of motion, and the ability to perform ordinary tasks.

The placement of physical therapy within an administratively labeled alternative-therapy program can make it appear more optional than it is. Classification affects political vulnerability. A service described as rehabilitation may be treated as medically necessary. The same service placed under a complementary or alternative heading may be treated as expendable.

For low-income patients, cash payment is often unrealistic. Chronic pain commonly coexists with reduced employment, disability, transportation difficulties, and other medical conditions. The patients most likely to need sustained therapy may be the least able to replace lost coverage privately.

The Missouri example is significant because it reveals how the state can claim to oppose opioid dependence while withdrawing services that were intended to provide alternatives. It also reveals the unequal political visibility of different expenditures. A relatively small health benefit may be eliminated in the name of savings, while far larger and more symbolically protected commitments receive little scrutiny.

The affected patient is not merely a line in a Medicaid budget. The patient may be a parent trying to remain employed, a grandparent caring for children, a disabled person trying to preserve independence, or an older adult attempting to avoid institutional care.

The harm may therefore extend well beyond pain.

6.3 The opioid-policy contradiction

The opioid crisis produced widespread public outrage. Political leaders condemned pharmaceutical misconduct, excessive prescribing, addiction, overdose deaths, and the destruction of families and communities. States pursued litigation, created task forces, distributed settlement funds, and promised to expand prevention and treatment.

Yet the same political system may reduce access to non-opioid approaches for chronic pain.

This contradiction reveals a fragmentation of policy. Opioid harm is treated as one administrative problem. Medicaid benefits are treated as another. Disability, employment, mental health, and rural care are separated into additional bureaucratic categories. No single institution is responsible for the whole person.

A state may recover money from opioid manufacturers while failing to preserve access to therapies that could reduce medication dependence. It may finance overdose reversal while limiting preventive care. It may denounce addiction while cutting the social and medical supports that help people avoid it.

The contradiction is especially severe in rural evangelical regions that have experienced high levels of chronic pain, workplace injury, disability, and opioid-related harm. Many residents performed physically demanding work in agriculture, manufacturing, mining, construction, transportation, or service industries. Their pain is not theoretical. It is the accumulated consequence of labor, injury, age, and inadequate medical access.

When therapy is removed, medication may become more attractive not because patients prefer drugs but because pills are easier to prescribe, reimburse, and distribute. A therapy visit requires a trained provider, travel, repeated appointments, and active participation. A prescription can appear cheaper in the immediate budget even when its long-term consequences are more costly.

This is a classic example of false economy. The state saves money on rehabilitation while potentially increasing expenditures through emergency care, surgery, disability, falls, unemployment, and medication-related complications.

The child remains present in this chain. A parent living with uncontrolled pain may be less able to work, sleep, regulate emotion, participate in family life, or provide consistent care. Children may take on adult responsibilities. Household income may decline. Stress and conflict may increase.

An opioid policy that ignores family structure is incomplete. Pain, addiction, disability, and austerity are intergenerational.

6.4 Rural hospitals and disappearing providers

Rural health systems are fragile because they depend upon small patient populations, limited specialist availability, long travel distances, and narrow financial margins. Public reimbursement is therefore not merely a benefit paid to an individual patient. It is part of the economic foundation that allows a local hospital or clinic to exist.

When Medicaid reimbursement declines or covered services are eliminated, providers may stop accepting Medicaid, reduce staff, close departments, or leave the community. A therapist may determine that a rural practice is no longer financially sustainable. A hospital may eliminate maternity care, rehabilitation, behavioral health, or pediatric services. A pharmacy may close because too few prescriptions remain profitable.

Once the provider disappears, the effect is not limited to Medicaid beneficiaries. Privately insured and self-paying patients also lose local access. A public cut can therefore weaken the health infrastructure used by the entire community.

Distance magnifies the problem. A service that technically remains available sixty or one hundred miles away may be functionally inaccessible to a patient who lacks transportation, cannot take time away from work, requires frequent appointments, or is physically unable to travel comfortably.

Children are affected when maternity units close, pediatric care becomes distant, emergency transport takes longer, or parents must miss work to obtain basic treatment. Families with disabled children face especially severe burdens because specialized therapy may require repeated visits over many years.

Rural churches often become informal support systems in these circumstances. Congregations organize transportation, meals, fundraisers, and emergency assistance. This generosity is valuable, but it cannot replace a functioning medical system. A church can help a family reach a distant hospital. It cannot create a pediatric specialist, operating room, rehabilitation department, or sustainable insurance network.

Private charity is frequently praised as the Christian alternative to public provision. Yet the scale mismatch is enormous. A congregation may raise several thousand dollars for one child while dozens of other families remain unseen. Medical costs can exceed the annual budget of the church itself.

Domestic austerity can therefore transform churches into unpaid emergency responders for harms produced by government policy. The church receives moral responsibility without receiving the resources or institutional capacity required to meet it.

6.5 Food assistance and childhood nutrition

Nutrition programs are among the clearest examples of how public policy affects children directly. Food is not simply a consumer good. It is a condition of development. Inadequate nutrition affects physical growth, immune function, concentration, emotional regulation, school attendance, and learning.

Yet food assistance is often discussed through adult moral categories. Political debate focuses on work, fraud, dependency, and personal responsibility. Children disappear behind the presumed failures of their parents.

This transfer of blame is unjust. A child does not choose household wages, rent, food prices, parental disability, job availability, or transportation. Even when adults make poor decisions, withholding adequate nutrition from children does not correct those decisions. It merely assigns the consequences to the least powerful members of the household.

Cuts in food assistance also affect family stability. When benefits are reduced, households may substitute cheaper and less nutritious food, skip meals, postpone medical care, fail to pay utilities, or rely upon high-cost debt. Hunger is rarely an isolated condition. It interacts with housing insecurity, illness, school performance, and parental stress.

Many evangelical churches operate food pantries and meal programs. Their work demonstrates that hunger is real and local. Yet the existence of church charity is sometimes used politically to argue that government programs are unnecessary.

The logic is reversed. Churches operate food pantries because household resources and public systems are insufficient. Their effort does not prove that public assistance can be removed. It reveals the scale of the need.

A pantry may provide several bags of groceries. It cannot guarantee nutritionally adequate food for every child throughout the month. It cannot replace school meals, infant nutrition programs, or nationwide purchasing support.

A child-centered Christian ethic must ask whether a policy predictably increases hunger. If it does, appeals to fiscal discipline cannot end the moral inquiry.

The central biblical question is not whether the recipient has passed an ideological test of independence. It is whether the hungry child is fed.

6.6 Disability services and family burden

Disability policy is frequently organized around waiting lists, eligibility definitions, service limits, reimbursement rates, and determinations of medical necessity. These administrative tools may appear neutral, but they determine how much unpaid labor families must absorb.

When public services are reduced, care does not disappear. It moves.

Parents provide more hours of supervision. Siblings assume responsibility. Grandparents help with transportation. One adult may reduce work hours or leave employment entirely. Families postpone retirement, consume savings, or move to obtain services.

The burden is especially intense for children with developmental, neurological, physical, or behavioral disabilities. Early intervention and sustained therapy can improve communication, mobility, independence, and participation in school. Delayed care may allow preventable problems to become permanent.

Austerity often treats such services as costs rather than investments. The immediate budget records an expenditure. It does not easily record the future income of a parent able to remain employed, the institutional care avoided, the independence preserved, or the educational progress made possible.

Evangelical rhetoric about family responsibility can intensify this burden. Families may be told that caring for disabled relatives is a sacred duty, which is true in a personal moral sense. The claim becomes abusive when used to justify withdrawing public support. Love does not create unlimited physical, financial, or medical capacity.

A parent may love a disabled child completely and still need skilled nursing, respite care, therapy, specialized equipment, transportation, or educational assistance. Government support does not replace family love. It makes sustained family care possible.

Churches also need support if they are to include disabled children and adults meaningfully. Accessibility, transportation, trained volunteers, sensory accommodations, and respite programs require resources. A political system that reduces disability services while praising churches for compassion transfers costs downward without acknowledging them.

The result can be isolation. Families stop attending worship because participation is too difficult. Parents become exhausted. Siblings feel neglected. Marriages experience stress. The disabled child becomes socially invisible.

Domestic austerity thus produces the very fragmentation that Christian community claims to oppose.

6.7 Maternal health and early childhood

The welfare of children begins before birth. Prenatal care, maternal nutrition, chronic-disease management, safe delivery, postpartum care, and access to local maternity services shape infant survival and long-term health.

This creates a profound test for evangelical pro-life politics. A movement that places exceptional moral emphasis upon fetal life should show equally serious concern for the health of pregnant women, newborns, and young children. Yet policies may protect pregnancy symbolically while limiting the systems that sustain mothers materially.

When maternity units close, women must travel farther for prenatal appointments and delivery. When insurance coverage is unstable, care may begin late or become interrupted. When postpartum services are inadequate, complications may go untreated. When mental-health care is unavailable, mothers may struggle without support.

The infant inherits every weakness in the system.

Early childhood programs are similarly vulnerable because their benefits are long-term and difficult to dramatize. Developmental screening, vaccination, speech therapy, nutrition assistance, safe housing, and parental support prevent harms that may otherwise appear years later.

Political systems often undervalue prevention because success is invisible. No headline announces that a child avoided developmental delay because therapy began early. No ceremony marks the emergency visit that did not occur because a family had stable primary care.

Military expenditure, by contrast, produces visible equipment, contracts, bases, and demonstrations of strength. The political symbolism is immediate.

A moral budget should not confuse visibility with value.

If evangelical politics claims to defend life, it must examine whether its domestic program supports the mother who carries life, the infant who begins it, and the family responsible for sustaining it.

A pro-life ethic that ends at birth is not a comprehensive ethic of life. It is a narrow political boundary.

6.8 Work requirements and the punishment of illness

Work requirements are often defended as a means of encouraging independence and ensuring that public benefits go only to people making a sufficient effort to support themselves. The principle appeals to widely held values of responsibility, reciprocity, and productive participation.

Yet the administrative reality is more complicated. Many beneficiaries already work in low-wage, part-time, seasonal, or unstable employment. Others provide unpaid care for children,

disabled relatives, or elderly parents. Some have illnesses that do not fit neatly within disability classifications but still make regular employment difficult.

A person with chronic pain may be capable of working if treatment is available and incapable of working if it is not. A parent may remain employed if child care, transportation, and medical access are stable and lose employment when one element fails.

Work requirements can therefore punish the very people trying to remain in the labor force. Documentation rules, fluctuating schedules, employer reporting failures, and periodic reviews may cause eligible people to lose coverage even when they are working.

The contradiction becomes especially sharp when a government simultaneously reduces the therapies that help people function. The state demands employment while withdrawing physical therapy. It requires punctuality while reducing transportation support. It requires parents to work while child care remains unaffordable. It insists upon independence while removing the tools that make independence possible.

This is not personal responsibility. It is institutional sabotage disguised as discipline.

Children bear the consequences when parents lose coverage or income. Medical debt competes with rent and food. Parental illness worsens. Household stress increases. A policy directed at adult behavior becomes a childhood condition.

Evangelical communities may support work requirements because work carries strong moral significance within Protestant culture. Yet work itself depends upon health, mobility, care networks, and opportunity. A theology of work that ignores these prerequisites can become punitive.

The question should not be whether work matters. It does. The question is whether policy makes productive participation realistically possible.

6.9 Administrative cruelty without visible perpetrators

The most effective forms of domestic austerity often have no single visible moment of denial. Harm emerges through procedures.

A benefit is reclassified. A form is not received. A deadline passes. A provider leaves the network. A reimbursement rate becomes unsustainable. A family waits on hold. A medical review is delayed. A service is declared optional. A letter is written in language the recipient cannot understand.

No official says that a child should suffer. Each participant performs a limited administrative task. Legislators approve broad savings targets. Agencies design rules. contractors process claims. providers make business decisions. families absorb the result.

Responsibility becomes so fragmented that everyone can claim innocence.

This is administrative cruelty: not necessarily cruelty motivated by personal hatred, but cruelty produced through systems that predictably impose suffering while concealing the human decision behind technical procedure.

It is especially difficult to confront because bureaucracy depersonalizes both victim and agent. The child becomes a case number. The denial becomes a compliance action. The official becomes an employee following policy.

The same moral distancing appears in war. A civilian death may pass through intelligence systems, target classifications, legal reviews, command structures, and remote weapons. At each stage, responsibility is divided.

Domestic and foreign blindness therefore share a structure. Harm is distributed across institutions until no participant feels fully accountable.

A child-centered ethic must reverse this fragmentation. It must reconnect policy with consequence. The question cannot end with whether the proper procedure was followed. It must ask what happened to the child.

Did the child receive treatment? Was the family able to obtain food? Did the mother reach a maternity unit? Could the disabled child attend school? Did the parent remain healthy enough to work? Was the rural hospital still open when the emergency occurred?

These are the outcomes by which policy should be judged.

Domestic austerity harms evangelical communities because those communities are part of the social body from which services are withdrawn. Their hospitals close. Their children lose coverage. Their disabled families wait. Their parents live with untreated pain. Their churches struggle to fill institutional gaps.

Yet the political meaning of these harms remains obscured. They are treated as unfortunate local problems rather than consequences of a governing philosophy.

The contrast with the Israel exception is therefore not merely financial. It is moral and perceptual. One commitment is made visible as sacred, permanent, and necessary. The other obligations are divided into programs that can be reduced, conditioned, delayed, or eliminated.

Children live inside the supposedly optional categories.

A theology that teaches believers to recognize divine purpose in a distant nation while failing to recognize political harm in their own congregation has not enlarged moral vision. It has narrowed it.

The task of recovery begins by seeing domestic policy not as an impersonal budget but as a structure governing the health, development, and future of children.

7. Children at the Center of the Moral Crisis

7.1 Why children must not remain a secondary concern

Children are frequently invoked in political rhetoric but rarely given decisive weight in policy. Governments speak of protecting the future, defending families, preserving civilization, and safeguarding national values. Yet when budgets are written, wars are conducted, benefits are restricted, or institutions are dismantled, children are often treated as indirect considerations rather than primary moral subjects.

This marginalization is partly structural. Children do not vote, hold office, finance campaigns, negotiate contracts, or control media institutions. They cannot withdraw political support from leaders who harm them. Their interests are represented by adults, and adult representatives frequently subordinate those interests to party loyalty, ideology, theology, military strategy, or short-term economic advantage.

Children are also dependent in ways that adults are not. They rely upon parents, relatives, schools, medical systems, food programs, public infrastructure, and social stability. When any of these systems fails, children have limited capacity to compensate. An adult may change jobs, move, seek legal assistance, purchase private services, or organize politically. A child usually cannot.

This dependence does not diminish children's moral status. It strengthens the obligations of adults. The greater the child's powerlessness, the greater the responsibility of institutions that govern the child's conditions of life.

Political systems often reverse this principle. Those with the least power are expected to absorb the greatest consequences. Children endure reductions in food assistance they did not authorize, loss of medical coverage they did not understand, wars they did not begin, displacement they did not choose, and inherited hatred they did not create.

A political theology that places children at the margins is therefore not merely incomplete. It is morally disordered.

The central question of this paper is not whether governments can prevent every harm. They cannot. Nor is it whether every policy must place children above all competing interests. Governments must consider security, law, economic sustainability, and the rights of many

groups. The question is whether children are treated as persons whose lives establish limits upon what adults may justify.

When the suffering of children becomes an acceptable cost of preserving a sacred political narrative, the narrative has acquired greater moral value than the child.

That is the crisis.

7.2 American children affected by domestic policy

American children are harmed by policy through mechanisms that often appear distant from childhood. A change in Medicaid eligibility may be written as an administrative reform. A reduction in food assistance may be described as fiscal restraint. A rural hospital closure may be explained as a market adjustment. A reduction in disability services may be presented as program integrity.

For the child, these distinctions disappear. The child experiences the result.

A child whose parent loses health coverage may live with an adult whose illness worsens. Household income may decline because the parent misses work or becomes unable to work. Medical debt may compete with rent, utilities, food, transportation, and school needs.

A child who loses direct coverage may miss preventive care, dental treatment, therapy, medication, or follow-up appointments. Minor conditions can become serious. Developmental problems may be recognized late. Chronic illness may interfere with attendance and learning.

Food insecurity can shape childhood physically and psychologically. A child may struggle to concentrate, worry about whether food will be available, conceal hunger from classmates, or experience shame when relying upon school meals or food pantries. Parents may skip meals to protect children, but children still perceive the stress surrounding scarcity.

Housing instability compounds these harms. Families facing medical bills or reduced assistance may move repeatedly, live in overcrowded conditions, or enter shelters. Each move can disrupt schooling, friendships, routines, transportation, and continuity of care.

Disabled children face additional vulnerabilities. Therapy, assistive equipment, behavioral support, skilled nursing, special education, and respite care are not luxuries. They shape the child's ability to communicate, move, learn, participate, and remain within the family home.

When services are reduced, the burden is transferred to households. Parents may reduce employment or leave work entirely. Siblings may receive less attention or assume caregiving roles. The whole family reorganizes around unmet need.

The language of personal responsibility is particularly unjust when applied to these children. They did not choose their parents' income, health status, employment stability, geography, or insurance. They cannot be made more responsible by being deprived.

A child-centered analysis therefore rejects the claim that domestic benefit reductions affect only adult recipients. Children live inside adult households. They receive the consequences of every policy imposed upon the adults who care for them.

The suffering may remain invisible because it is dispersed across millions of private homes. There is no single battlefield, explosion, or public event. There are missed appointments, empty refrigerators, exhausted parents, untreated pain, delayed development, and quiet fear.

The absence of spectacle does not reduce the seriousness of the harm.

7.3 Palestinian children affected by war and occupation

Palestinian children live within a political environment they did not create. They did not design armed organizations, negotiate borders, construct military strategies, or determine the policies of Israel, Palestinian authorities, regional governments, or foreign powers. Yet they bear the consequences of decisions made by all of them.

War exposes children to direct physical danger. They may be killed, wounded, burned, trapped, or permanently disabled. Medical systems may be overwhelmed or damaged. Treatment may be delayed because roads, hospitals, electricity, water, communications, and supply chains have been disrupted.

Children who survive physical injury may face long rehabilitation with limited resources. A limb injury, neurological trauma, infection, untreated fracture, or loss of sight can alter the entire course of a life. When rehabilitation services are unavailable, the consequences of the original injury become more severe.

Hunger and dehydration affect children rapidly. Infants and young children are especially vulnerable because their bodies have fewer reserves and their development depends upon adequate nutrition. Pregnant women suffering deprivation also transmit risk to the unborn child.

Displacement creates another layer of harm. A child may lose a home, school, neighborhood, relatives, possessions, and familiar routines in a single period of violence. Temporary shelter may be crowded, unsafe, unsanitary, or repeatedly relocated.

Education can collapse under these conditions. Schools may close, be damaged, serve as shelters, or become inaccessible. Years of interrupted schooling affect literacy, employment, social development, and future political stability.

Psychological trauma may remain after physical danger recedes. Children can experience nightmares, separation anxiety, regression, emotional numbness, aggression, difficulty concentrating, and persistent fear. The destruction of ordinary life teaches them that safety is temporary and adults cannot protect them.

The category of collective responsibility is especially dangerous. Children may be treated as though they belong morally to the actions of armed groups operating within their society. Their innocence is weakened by association. Civilian protection becomes conditional upon political identity.

This is a failure of moral judgment. A child does not lose human worth because adults claim to fight in the child's name or operate nearby. Nor does the existence of a genuine security threat erase the obligation to distinguish combatants from children.

Palestinian children are also frequently absent from evangelical prophetic narratives. They may appear only as members of a hostile population surrounding Israel. Their personal histories, names, families, churches, schools, illnesses, talents, and hopes disappear behind geopolitical categories.

Palestinian Christians expose the inadequacy of this simplification. Their existence demonstrates that the region cannot be reduced to a conflict between biblical Israel and an undifferentiated non-Christian enemy. They are part of ancient Christian communities and share the same vulnerability to displacement, violence, and institutional collapse.

A theology that speaks passionately about holy land while overlooking the children living upon it has confused geography with holiness.

7.4 Israeli children affected by violence and militarization

Israeli children also suffer within the conflict. They may experience rocket attacks, terrorism, hostage-taking, violent incursions, displacement, bereavement, and the persistent fear that ordinary public spaces can become targets.

A child living under repeated alarms may learn to associate daily life with emergency. Schools, homes, buses, festivals, and public gatherings can become places of danger. Families may practice rapid movement to shelters. Parents may attempt to provide reassurance while experiencing fear themselves.

Hostage-taking represents a particularly direct assault upon childhood and family life. Children may be abducted, separated from parents, exposed to violence, or used as instruments of political pressure. Families left behind endure uncertainty, helplessness, and public grief.

Bereaved Israeli children may lose parents, siblings, relatives, teachers, or friends. The resulting trauma can shape identity and attitudes toward Palestinians for decades. Fear and grief can become incorporated into national narratives and political expectations.

Militarization affects children even before they enter military service. They grow up within a society where security is a central organizing concern. Military language, uniforms, memorials, threats, and preparation for service form part of civic identity.

This environment may be understandable given the history of antisemitism, persecution, war, and terrorism. Yet understandable conditions are not harmless conditions. A society organized around permanent threat risks passing trauma from one generation to the next.

Unconditional foreign support does not necessarily protect Israeli children. It may encourage political leaders to pursue strategies that produce short-term military advantage while deepening long-term hostility. A child may be defended from one immediate threat while being placed within a future of recurring war.

A true concern for Israeli children must therefore include more than weapons and deterrence. It must include diplomacy, accountability, restraint, regional stability, psychological care, education for coexistence, and political structures that reduce the likelihood of future violence.

The assumption that military escalation automatically equals child protection is too simple. Military force may sometimes be necessary to stop immediate attacks. It can also produce new grievances, radicalization, revenge, and insecurity.

Israeli children should not be used as moral shields for policies that may place them in greater danger over time.

Their lives are not served by a theology that welcomes conflict as prophecy. They are served by adults committed to making another generation of war less likely.

7.5 Selective innocence

One of the clearest signs of moral blindness is selective innocence. Children are not viewed according to a single standard. Their innocence is intensified or diminished according to nationality, religion, ethnicity, political identity, or usefulness within a preferred narrative.

A child belonging to the favored population is individualized. The child is named, photographed, described, and remembered. The child's family is interviewed. Personal interests, personality, school life, and future dreams are made visible.

A child belonging to the disfavored population may appear only in a number. The child becomes part of a casualty total, demographic category, refugee population, or security problem. The absence of biography makes emotional identification more difficult.

Selective innocence also operates through inherited blame. Palestinian children may be associated with terrorism, even when they had no connection to armed activity. Israeli children may be associated with state violence, even when they had no role in military decisions. American children in poor households may be associated with parental dependency, even though they made no economic choices.

In each case, adults transfer political judgment onto children.

The favored child is innocent because adults identify with the child's group. The disfavored child becomes conditionally innocent because adults distrust the surrounding population.

Christian ethics should reject this hierarchy. Innocence is not distributed by nationality. Vulnerability is not diminished by ethnicity. A child's right to protection does not depend upon whether the child belongs to an allied population.

Selective innocence corrupts the pro-life claim. A consistent commitment to life cannot protect unborn children within one political context while accepting the preventable death, hunger, or medical abandonment of children in another.

The relevant distinction is not between valuable and less valuable children. It is between policies that protect children and policies that expose them to avoidable harm.

7.6 Children reduced to symbols

Political movements frequently use children as symbols. A photograph of a harmed child can become evidence of an enemy's cruelty, a government's failure, or a population's victimhood. Such images may convey important truth, but they can also instrumentalize the child.

The symbolic child is valued for what the child proves.

An Israeli child may symbolize the vulnerability of Israel, the persistence of antisemitic violence, or the necessity of military defense. A Palestinian child may symbolize occupation, war, civilian suffering, or the brutality of state power. An American child may symbolize poverty, family breakdown, government dependency, or the need for social protection.

Once a child becomes a symbol, the complexity of the child's life disappears. The image is used to confirm a preexisting political conclusion.

Selective symbolism creates asymmetry. The suffering of one side's children is circulated widely, while the suffering of the other side's children is questioned, minimized, or explained away. Each political community sees the children who justify its cause.

This process can produce competitive victimhood. Concern for one group of children is treated as hostility toward another. To mourn Palestinian children is interpreted as indifference to Israeli children. To mourn Israeli children is interpreted as indifference to Palestinians.

The moral field is divided when it should be expanded.

Children should not be required to compete for recognition. Compassion is not a finite resource. Recognizing the suffering of one child does not diminish another child's suffering.

A child-centered ethic refuses to use children merely as evidence. It asks what policies would actually preserve their lives, health, families, education, and future.

The child must remain a person after the photograph has served its political purpose.

7.7 Intergenerational trauma

Conflict and deprivation do not end when the immediate event ends. They are transmitted through families, institutions, memory, and social identity.

A child who loses a parent may carry grief into adulthood. A child exposed to violence may become hypervigilant, emotionally withdrawn, or aggressive. A child displaced from home may grow up with a persistent sense of insecurity. A child who experiences hunger may develop long-term physical and psychological consequences.

Trauma also shapes political interpretation. Children learn from the stories adults tell about why suffering occurred and who caused it. Those stories may provide meaning, but they can also preserve hatred.

Israeli children may inherit the memory of persecution, terrorism, war, and existential threat. Palestinian children may inherit the memory of displacement, occupation, bombing, imprisonment, and loss of land or home. American children may inherit the consequences of poverty, addiction, institutional abandonment, racial inequality, or rural decline.

Each community can teach its children that another group is responsible for their pain. When this occurs, trauma becomes political inheritance.

Intergenerational trauma does not excuse violence. It explains why cycles of violence are difficult to break. A traumatized generation may seek security through domination, revenge, withdrawal, or ideological certainty.

Policies that ignore trauma may secure a temporary pause while preserving the conditions for future conflict. Children who grow up without safety, dignity, education, or hope become adults shaped by those absences.

The same is true domestically. A child who grows up with unstable housing, untreated illness, parental disability, or food insecurity may enter adulthood with poorer health, reduced educational opportunity, and limited economic security. The consequences then affect the next generation.

Domestic austerity and war therefore share an intergenerational structure. Adults achieve short-term political objectives by transferring long-term costs to children.

A moral policy must account for those future costs. It must ask not only how many lives are protected today but what kind of adults today's children are being formed to become.

7.8 The child as a test of theological truth

Theological systems are often evaluated through scriptural coherence, historical pedigree, doctrinal consistency, and institutional authority. These are important measures. Yet a theology should also be judged by its moral fruit.

Does it make suffering easier to see or easier to dismiss?

Does it deepen compassion or restrict compassion to the favored group?

Does it promote peace, accountability, and protection of the vulnerable, or does it make violence appear inevitable and therefore less urgent to prevent?

Does it lead adults to protect children, or does it explain why children must suffer for a greater political purpose?

The treatment of children provides a particularly clear test because children expose the limits of blame. Adults may argue about responsibility, ideology, national interest, and historical grievance. The child stands within the consequences without possessing the power that produced them.

Jesus repeatedly brought the overlooked person into the center of moral attention. Children, the poor, the sick, the outsider, and the socially diminished were not treated as peripheral to the Kingdom of God. They became measures of faithfulness.

A theology that places modern Israel within prophecy but fails to place Palestinian children within Christian concern is morally incomplete. A theology that proclaims family values while supporting policies that destabilize poor families is morally inconsistent. A theology that identifies itself as pro-life while accepting preventable childhood suffering has reduced life to a partisan category.

The child tests whether theology remains connected to the character of Christ.

This test does not produce a simple policy formula. Christians may disagree about the proper scope of government, the use of military force, the structure of foreign aid, or the best means of reducing poverty. The child-centered test does not eliminate prudential disagreement.

It does establish a burden of justification.

Adults who support a policy that foreseeably harms children must explain why the harm is unavoidable, proportionate, and less destructive than the alternatives. They may not simply invoke prophecy, national identity, fiscal restraint, or partisan loyalty.

The suffering child is moral evidence.

The central failure of dispensationalist blindness is that it can make this evidence disappear. Children become collateral damage, demographic threat, entitlement cost, security risk, or prophetic necessity.

The corrective begins by restoring the child as a person before every category.

An American child is more than a Medicaid beneficiary.

A Palestinian child is more than a resident of hostile territory.

An Israeli child is more than a symbol of national survival.

Each child is a life with a body, family, memory, fear, capacity, and future.

A political theology that cannot see this equally has failed its most basic moral test.

The crisis examined in this paper is therefore not merely about the distribution of money or the interpretation of prophecy. It is about whether adults will permit sacred narratives to make children invisible.

The Christian answer should be unambiguous: no prophecy, nation, party, alliance, or ideology is entitled to such blindness.

8. Language, Abstraction, and the Concealment of Suffering

8.1 The bureaucratic vocabulary of domestic harm

Government rarely announces that it intends to deprive a child of food, medical treatment, therapy, housing stability, or family security. Harm is more often introduced through administrative language that removes the person from view. Benefits are not taken away; eligibility is revised. Services are not denied; programs are streamlined. Hospitals are not

weakened; reimbursement structures are modernized. Families are not abandoned; fiscal sustainability is restored.

Such vocabulary performs an important political function. It converts moral choices into technical adjustments. A legislator can support “cost containment” without imagining the child whose physical therapy ends. An administrator can implement “program integrity measures” without seeing the mother who loses coverage because she failed to submit a document on time. A voter can approve “entitlement reform” without confronting the empty refrigerator, missed medical appointment, or exhausted caregiver produced by the reform.

The language is not always intentionally deceptive. Governments require technical terminology to administer complex systems. Budgets, eligibility categories, reimbursement codes, and actuarial projections are necessary. The problem arises when technical language becomes the only language permitted. The policy is then described entirely from the perspective of the institution rather than the person affected.

Consider the phrase optional benefit. Within Medicaid law, the term distinguishes services that states are not federally required to provide. Administratively, the category has a precise meaning. Morally, however, the label can be misleading. A service may be optional for the state while being indispensable to the patient. Physical therapy may be legally optional but functionally necessary for a child learning to walk, an injured parent trying to remain employed, or a disabled adult attempting to avoid institutional care.

The administrative category silently replaces the human reality. What is optional for the budget becomes optional in public imagination.

The phrase personal responsibility performs a similar function. It implies that hardship results primarily from individual choice. The language may be appropriate in some circumstances, but it becomes morally distorting when applied to children, disabled people, chronically ill adults, or workers whose employment does not provide adequate insurance. Responsibility is shifted downward while political responsibility disappears.

Work requirements can therefore be described as incentives rather than as conditions that may remove health coverage. Benefit reductions become efforts to encourage independence. Repeated documentation becomes accountability. The possibility that a bureaucratic system can itself create dependency, instability, and illness receives less attention.

Administrative abstraction also protects the decision-maker from emotional burden. A person who directly denied food to a hungry child would experience moral pressure. A person who votes to reduce a program by a percentage may feel only that a budget has been balanced. The intervening bureaucracy absorbs the human consequence.

The language of domestic policy therefore determines who becomes visible. Agencies see caseloads. Legislatures see appropriations. Providers see reimbursement rates. Families see pain, hunger, fear, and lost opportunity. A morally serious analysis must reconnect these perspectives.

Every technical phrase should be translated back into human terms. How many children lose access? Which illnesses go untreated? Which parents leave work? Which rural services disappear? Which disabilities worsen? Which costs are merely transferred to families, emergency rooms, schools, or future budgets?

Without this translation, austerity can appear clean because the suffering has been removed from the sentence.

8.2 The military vocabulary of foreign harm

Military institutions also rely upon specialized language. Terms such as target, proportionality, collateral damage, operational necessity, human shields, evacuation zone, force protection, strategic objective, and acceptable loss help commanders plan and describe actions under conditions of danger. Some of these concepts are essential to military law and efforts to limit civilian harm.

Yet the same vocabulary can conceal suffering when it becomes detached from the bodies and lives it describes.

Collateral damage does not sound like a child with a crushed limb, a parent searching through rubble, or a family sleeping in a temporary shelter. The phrase places civilian death at the edge of the operation rather than at the center of the victim's world. To the military planner, the child may be collateral to the target. To the child's family, the child is not collateral to anything.

The expression human shields can also become morally expansive. Armed groups may indeed operate among civilians, use civilian infrastructure, or deliberately increase danger to noncombatants. Such conduct is reprehensible. But the presence of an armed actor near civilians does not erase those civilians' moral status. Nor does it make every level of force automatically justified.

When the phrase is used carelessly, responsibility for civilian death is transferred entirely to the enemy. The attacking force is described as having no meaningful choice. The suffering child becomes evidence of the enemy's cruelty rather than a reason to reconsider the method, timing, scale, or necessity of the attack.

Evacuation language may similarly conceal practical impossibility. A map can designate a safe zone. An order can instruct civilians to leave. Yet a child may be injured, a parent may lack

transportation, a hospital may contain patients who cannot be moved, roads may be damaged, communications may fail, and the designated destination may itself be unsafe or overcrowded.

The existence of an evacuation order does not prove that evacuation was feasible.

Military language can also create an illusion of precision. Advanced weapons, surveillance, intelligence, and legal review may suggest that harm is fully controlled. Precision in striking a selected location, however, is not identical to precision in moral consequence. A weapon may hit the intended structure and still kill children, destroy medical capacity, displace families, or produce future instability.

The language of security can become especially powerful within Christian Zionist politics. Once an operation is framed as necessary for Israel's survival, further moral inquiry may appear disloyal. Questions about proportionality, civilian protection, or alternatives can be dismissed as failure to understand the threat.

Yet security is not a magic word. Every government invokes security. The moral task is to determine whether a particular action genuinely protects people, whether the scale of force is justified, whether alternatives existed, and whether the action creates greater danger in the future.

Language becomes dangerous when it ends inquiry instead of enabling it.

8.3 Distance from consequences

Modern institutions allow decisions to be made far from their consequences. Legislators vote on large bills containing hundreds of provisions. Military officers act through chains of command. Intelligence analysts classify targets. Agencies apply rules written elsewhere. Contractors process claims. Citizens vote for candidates whose policies will later be implemented by systems they may never observe.

Distance reduces emotional immediacy.

A person who sees a wounded child may respond instinctively. A person who sees a budget table, satellite image, eligibility category, or casualty estimate encounters the same reality in abstract form. The abstraction may be necessary for governance, but it weakens the natural connection between action and consequence.

Technological distance magnifies this effect. Military operations can be conducted through screens, sensors, aircraft, algorithms, and remote systems. Domestic administration can be conducted through databases, automated notices, call centers, and digital eligibility checks. The decision-maker may never meet the affected person.

No single participant experiences the whole causal chain.

A legislator approves a funding reduction. An agency modifies a regulation. A provider closes a program. A parent cannot find treatment. A child's condition worsens. Each stage is separated by time, institution, and responsibility. Because no participant performs the entire act, each can regard the final outcome as unintended.

The same fragmentation occurs in war. Intelligence identifies a location. Lawyers review legality. commanders authorize force. operators execute the order. medical workers receive the wounded. Families bury the dead. Every stage has its own language and institutional logic.

The distribution of responsibility can become a distribution of innocence.

A child-centered ethic must resist this fragmentation. It must trace the complete path from policy to outcome. It must ask who authorized the conditions, who benefited, who bore the risk, what alternatives existed, and whether foreseeable consequences were treated seriously.

Foreseeability matters. A government need not explicitly intend to harm children in order to bear responsibility for predictable harm. If cutting therapy predictably worsens disability, the absence of malicious intent does not erase accountability. If military action predictably kills or displaces children, calling the outcome unintended does not settle the moral question.

Distance may explain why people fail to see consequences. It does not absolve them from the obligation to look.

8.4 Statistical children

Large-scale suffering must be measured. Governments, researchers, humanitarian organizations, hospitals, and journalists need numbers to understand magnitude, allocate resources, compare outcomes, and identify patterns. Statistics are indispensable.

Yet numbers can both reveal and conceal.

A casualty total communicates scale, but it can also make individual lives interchangeable. Ten injured children become a figure. Ten thousand displaced children become a trend. A decline in Medicaid enrollment becomes a percentage. A reduction in food assistance becomes projected savings.

The more people affected, the harder it can become to imagine any one of them.

This paradox is central to public policy. A single named child may evoke intense compassion. A million unnamed children may be processed as an administrative problem. Human emotion does not naturally increase in proportion to the number of people suffering. It can flatten.

Political actors exploit this limitation. Numbers may be disputed, selectively presented, stripped of context, or divided into categories that support a preferred narrative. Civilian casualty

estimates may be dismissed because sources are imperfect. Poverty statistics may be minimized through narrow definitions. Children losing benefits may be described as procedural removals rather than as human losses.

Statistical uncertainty can become an excuse for moral indifference. Because the exact number is contested, the reality of widespread harm is treated as uncertain. Yet imperfect measurement does not imply nonexistent suffering.

The child-centered response is not to abandon statistics but to humanize them. Aggregate data should be paired with concrete consequences. A percentage reduction in therapy should be translated into children who lose mobility gains. A hospital closure should be translated into travel time during emergencies. A food-benefit cut should be translated into meals, school performance, and parental choices.

Likewise, casualty numbers should not remain mere totals. They represent children with names, bodies, relationships, fears, routines, and unrealized futures.

Statistics should enlarge moral vision rather than replace it.

A mature public ethic must hold two forms of knowledge together: the scale visible in numbers and the person visible in narrative. Without numbers, suffering can be dismissed as anecdotal. Without persons, suffering can be dismissed as statistical.

The statistical child must be restored to human identity.

8.5 The disappearance of Palestinian Christians

Palestinian Christians pose a particular challenge to simplified evangelical narratives about Israel. Their presence disrupts the assumption that the region can be divided neatly between biblical Israel and a uniformly Muslim or anti-Christian opposition.

Palestinian Christian communities have deep historical roots in the region. They worship in places central to Christian memory, maintain churches and institutions, and understand themselves as part of the continuing Christian presence in the land associated with Jesus and the early Church.

Yet they are frequently absent from American evangelical discussion.

Their disappearance serves an ideological function. If Palestinians are imagined only as Muslims, terrorists, demographic threats, or obstacles to prophecy, evangelical sympathy becomes easier to restrict. The conflict can be interpreted as a struggle between Judeo-Christian civilization and hostile religious forces.

Palestinian Christians complicate this frame. They may experience displacement, movement restrictions, economic hardship, violence, property loss, or the effects of military operations while sharing the Christian faith of the Americans who overlook them.

Their testimony also challenges the assumption that Christian concern for Israel must take the form of unconditional political support. Palestinian Christians may read the same Scriptures differently. They may emphasize justice, land, suffering, reconciliation, and the dangers of using theology to legitimize state power.

Their voices are sometimes treated as politically compromised or theologically suspect because they do not confirm dispensational expectations. This dismissal reveals the power of the interpretive system. Christians living in the land can become less authoritative to American evangelicals than prophecy teachers viewing the region through a distant ideological lens.

The disappearance of Palestinian Christians also affects children. Christian schools, families, churches, and communities face the same insecurity that surrounds the broader Palestinian population. Children may lose homes, education, mobility, relatives, or confidence in a future within their ancestral communities.

A theology that reveres Bethlehem while failing to see the children living in and around it has converted place into symbol and persons into background.

Restoring Palestinian Christians to visibility does not require accepting every political claim made by their leaders or institutions. It requires acknowledging their existence, hearing their testimony, and refusing to exclude them from Christian moral concern.

Their presence makes one truth unavoidable: support for a modern state cannot define the full meaning of Christian solidarity in the Holy Land.

8.6 Antisemitism accusations and the suppression of policy criticism

Antisemitism is real, ancient, and lethal. Jewish communities have experienced expulsion, forced conversion, conspiracy theories, economic exclusion, pogroms, racial persecution, genocide, and continuing threats. Christians bear a particular responsibility to confront this history because Christian teachings and institutions were often involved in creating or sustaining anti-Jewish hostility.

For this reason, criticism involving Israel must be careful, specific, and disciplined. Jewish people must not be blamed collectively for the actions of the Israeli government. Political analysis must avoid stereotypes about money, secret control, dual loyalty, or ethnic character. The diversity of Jewish opinion must be recognized.

At the same time, the seriousness of antisemitism must not be used to place a government beyond criticism.

A state is not an ethnicity. A cabinet is not a religion. A military operation is not the Jewish people. A settlement policy is not Judaism. Criticism of a law, leader, war, lobbying effort, or aid program is not automatically antisemitic.

When these categories are collapsed, democratic discussion becomes impossible. Any objection can be portrayed as hostility toward Jews. The accusation becomes a shield protecting policies that should remain open to scrutiny.

This suppression is particularly effective within evangelical communities because believers may already fear that criticism of Israel constitutes opposition to God. Political and theological penalties reinforce one another. The critic risks being called both antisemitic and unbiblical.

The result is silence.

Silence harms Palestinians because abuses may go unchallenged. It also harms Israelis and Jews because unaccountable governments can pursue policies that increase danger, damage international legitimacy, deepen conflict, or falsely claim to act on behalf of all Jewish people.

Conflating Israel with all Jews can itself reproduce an antisemitic structure by assigning collective responsibility to a global population for the decisions of one state.

A responsible moral vocabulary must therefore make precise distinctions. Antisemitism should be named when it occurs. Criticism should be evaluated by its content, evidence, language, and target. Neither genuine hatred nor cynical accusations of hatred should be tolerated.

The purpose of this distinction is not rhetorical convenience. It is moral clarity. Children cannot be protected when language prevents adults from naming harmful policy.

8.7 Media asymmetry and controlled visibility

Public compassion depends heavily upon what people are shown. Media institutions decide which events receive sustained coverage, which victims are named, which images are broadcast, which experts are invited, and which historical contexts are emphasized.

Visibility is therefore a form of power.

When the suffering of one population is individualized and the suffering of another is generalized, audiences learn to value them differently. A named child with a photograph, biography, grieving family, and recorded voice becomes morally present. An anonymous child within a disputed casualty total remains distant.

Media asymmetry does not require a single centralized conspiracy. It can arise from access, language, institutional relationships, audience expectations, security restrictions, government messaging, editorial habits, and political pressure. Reporters may have greater ability to document one side. Officials may provide polished narratives. Images may be restricted, delayed, or challenged. Audiences may respond more strongly to victims with whom they identify.

Evangelical media add another layer. News involving Israel may be filtered through prophecy, civilizational conflict, and biblical loyalty. Israeli fear and vulnerability may be emphasized, while Palestinian history and daily life receive little sustained attention. Conversely, media hostile to Israel may individualize Palestinian suffering while minimizing Israeli trauma, terrorism, or fear.

Both forms of asymmetry distort moral perception.

Domestic policy suffers from a different visibility problem. The child harmed by Medicaid changes or food-benefit reductions rarely appears in breaking news. The injury is gradual, private, and administratively dispersed. There may be no dramatic image. A rural clinic closes quietly. A therapy appointment is canceled. A parent postpones treatment. A family moves.

Because the suffering lacks spectacle, it struggles to compete with symbolic political events.

Controlled visibility therefore helps explain why voters can remain emotionally invested in distant geopolitical narratives while overlooking policy harms within their own counties. The distant issue is continuously narrated. The local harm is episodic and technical.

A democratic society requires deliberate correction of this imbalance. Journalists, churches, researchers, and citizens must seek the people who remain unseen. They must ask whose names are missing, whose suffering is described only statistically, whose testimony is excluded, and which institutions benefit from that exclusion.

The purpose is not to create a new hierarchy of victims. It is to prevent any child from disappearing behind the narrative preferred by adults.

Language and visibility shape conscience. What is named can be mourned. What is measured can be debated. What is photographed can become real. What remains abstract can be sacrificed.

The moral danger examined in this section is therefore not simply false information. It is the organization of attention.

Bureaucratic language can hide domestic deprivation. Military language can hide bodily harm. Institutional distance can dissolve responsibility. Statistics can erase individuality. Simplified

theology can erase Palestinian Christians. accusations of antisemitism can silence legitimate criticism. Media asymmetry can determine which children are seen as fully human.

These mechanisms do not merely describe suffering. They govern whether suffering enters political consciousness at all.

The corrective begins with disciplined translation. Every abstraction must be returned to the person it affects. Every projected saving must be connected to the service removed. Every military objective must be connected to the civilians placed at risk. Every casualty figure must be understood as a collection of individual lives. Every theological claim must be tested against the people made invisible by it.

A policy that cannot be defended after its consequences are described in ordinary human language should not be protected by technical terminology.

The task of moral vision is to make the hidden child visible again.

9. The Political Economy of Sacred and Disposable Spending

9.1 Who is considered deserving of government protection?

Public budgets are not merely financial documents. They are moral maps. They reveal which people, institutions, industries, and national commitments a government considers worthy of protection and which it regards as expendable.

Political debate often presents spending decisions as neutral responses to scarcity. Resources are limited, officials say, and difficult choices must be made. Scarcity is real. No government possesses unlimited money, personnel, time, or institutional capacity. Yet scarcity alone does not determine which programs are protected. Political power, ideology, identity, lobbying, theology, and public symbolism shape the distribution of sacrifice.

The language of deservingness plays a central role. Some recipients are portrayed as responsible, productive, strategic, innocent, or essential. Others are described as dependent, inefficient, fraudulent, burdensome, or morally suspect.

A defense contractor is rarely described as dependent upon government, even when its revenue relies heavily upon public contracts. A hospital receiving public reimbursement may be described as part of essential infrastructure, but the patient receiving Medicaid may be described as an entitlement beneficiary. A foreign military ally may be treated as the recipient of an inviolable commitment, while a disabled child must repeatedly prove eligibility for therapy or assistance.

The same transfer of public resources is classified differently according to the status of the recipient.

This classification affects evangelical political judgment. Support for Israel is often framed through images of survival, covenant, strategic alliance, and moral duty. Assistance therefore appears honorable. Domestic welfare is more often framed through suspicion, dependency, fraud, and personal failure. Assistance appears morally compromising.

The contrast is especially revealing when the domestic recipient is a child. Children cannot reasonably be blamed for poverty, illness, disability, or family instability. Yet programs serving them remain entangled in political narratives directed at adults. A child may lose assistance because lawmakers wish to discipline parents, reduce dependence, or shrink government.

The child is punished through a theory of adult deservingness.

A child-centered political economy begins from a different question. It asks not whether the household perfectly satisfies an ideological standard, but whether children possess food, shelter, health care, education, safety, and the conditions necessary for development.

The legitimacy of government protection should be judged by human need, public responsibility, and foreseeable consequences rather than by the symbolic prestige of the recipient.

9.2 Entitlement at home and obligation abroad

The word entitlement has acquired a negative meaning in American politics. It suggests an unreasonable expectation that government owes benefits to individuals regardless of effort, contribution, or merit. The term is frequently attached to domestic programs involving health care, food, housing, disability, or income support.

Foreign military assistance to a favored ally is rarely described this way. It is called an obligation, commitment, alliance, or strategic necessity.

The distinction reveals a political double standard. A low-income American family receiving health coverage may be accused of believing it is entitled to public support. A foreign government receiving repeated military assistance may be treated as possessing a legitimate expectation that support will continue.

The domestic recipient is subjected to moral scrutiny. Did the parent work enough? Were the forms completed correctly? Is every household member eligible? Could family or church support replace the benefit? Might assistance encourage dependency?

The foreign recipient may face a different presumption. Continued assistance is treated as the baseline. Conditions are resisted as betrayal. Questions about conduct, strategy, or opportunity cost may be discouraged.

This does not mean that domestic benefits should be unconditional or that foreign alliances should not exist. It means that both should be governed by coherent standards. Public resources should serve identifiable purposes, produce measurable benefits, remain accountable, and be reconsidered when they fail.

The theological Israel exception disrupts this symmetry. It transforms a foreign commitment into a sacred obligation while treating domestic care as a negotiable entitlement.

The contrast is most severe when assistance abroad contributes to military capacity while support at home concerns basic human development. Weapons are described as necessary. Therapy is described as optional. Missile defense is protected. Pediatric access is contingent. Diplomatic commitments endure across administrations. Food assistance depends upon periodic political struggle.

A political system can therefore become more certain of its obligations to a foreign military relationship than of its obligations to children within its jurisdiction.

This hierarchy is not dictated by Scripture. It is politically constructed and theologically defended.

9.3 Protected and unprotected budgets

Some parts of government spending are treated as protected. Others are expected to justify their existence repeatedly.

Protected budgets benefit from strong institutions, powerful constituencies, long-term contracts, national-security claims, or sacred political symbolism. Their continuation becomes normal. Their reduction is described as dangerous.

Unprotected budgets serve populations with less political power. They are fragmented across agencies and administrative categories. Their beneficiaries may lack organized representation, financial influence, or public sympathy. Their reduction is described as reform.

Military and security spending often enjoys structural protection because leaders fear being accused of weakness. Support for Israel may receive additional protection from strategic, historical, religious, and partisan commitments.

Programs serving poor children, disabled families, rural patients, and low-income workers rarely possess equivalent protection. Their advocates must prove need, effectiveness, and moral

legitimacy repeatedly. Even successful programs remain vulnerable because their achievements often consist of harms that did not occur.

A child who remained healthy because of preventive care does not generate a dramatic political image. A developmental delay avoided through therapy is difficult to display. A family that remained housed because of temporary assistance does not become a symbol of national strength.

Weapons systems, military facilities, and diplomatic announcements are more visible. They provide ceremonies, contracts, jobs, speeches, and claims of decisive action.

Visibility helps create protection.

This imbalance produces a recurring pattern. Social programs are cut because they are considered adjustable. Military and geopolitical commitments remain intact because they are considered foundational.

The political question is therefore not merely how much government spends. It is which expenditures are allowed to become permanent assumptions and which remain perpetual defendants.

Children live primarily within the latter category.

9.4 Deficits and selective fiscal alarm

Fiscal conservatism claims to oppose excessive spending, debt, and deficits. These concerns are legitimate. Persistent debt can limit future choices, increase interest costs, transfer burdens across generations, and weaken public capacity during emergencies.

Yet fiscal alarm is often selective.

Deficits associated with social programs are described as evidence of irresponsibility. Deficits associated with tax reductions, military expansion, emergency appropriations, or favored alliances may receive less moral condemnation.

The difference reveals that deficit politics is not governed solely by arithmetic. It is governed by beliefs about worthy and unworthy spending.

A dollar allocated to health care for a poor child may be treated as consumption. A dollar allocated to defense may be treated as investment, even when both are financed through borrowing. The health expenditure may improve educational performance, prevent disability, reduce future emergency care, and support parental employment. These benefits may be economically substantial, but they are not always counted in the same manner as visible military assets or industrial contracts.

Selective fiscal alarm allows leaders to demand sacrifice from vulnerable households while protecting politically favored commitments.

Children are often invoked rhetorically as the reason to reduce debt. Politicians warn that today's spending will burden future generations. Yet the same children may be deprived of health care, nutrition, education, or environmental protection in the name of preserving their fiscal future.

This is a false separation. Children inherit both public debt and the condition of the society built with or denied by public spending. They inherit roads, hospitals, schools, scientific capacity, military obligations, environmental damage, untreated disease, and social instability.

A smaller deficit does not automatically compensate for a damaged childhood.

Fiscal responsibility should therefore include the prevention of long-term human costs. Failing to treat a child's illness, support a disabled family, or preserve a rural hospital can create future liabilities larger than the immediate saving.

A child-centered fiscal policy asks not only what government borrows but what society fails to build.

9.5 Budget silos and displaced costs

Government programs are divided into departments, agencies, funding streams, and legislative committees. This organization is necessary for administration, but it can create the illusion that savings within one program are genuine social savings.

A state may reduce spending on physical therapy. The Medicaid budget records a reduction. If patients later require emergency care, surgery, disability payments, home assistance, or institutional care, those costs may appear in different accounts.

The original cut is still described as a saving because the displaced expense is recorded elsewhere.

The same process occurs when food support is reduced. The nutrition budget declines, but schools, hospitals, charities, and families absorb consequences. Children may have poorer health or educational performance. Parents may miss work. Churches may increase emergency assistance.

No single budget records the whole cost.

This fragmentation rewards short-term reductions and hides long-term damage. Legislators can claim fiscal discipline during the current budget cycle while future administrations, federal programs, private households, and nonprofit organizations inherit the consequences.

Foreign policy can create similar displacement. Military assistance may be evaluated through the immediate value of weapons or alliance commitments while broader costs appear through regional instability, refugee flows, diplomatic consequences, security threats, veterans' care, or future military involvement.

The political system protects itself through accounting boundaries. A cost is considered someone else's problem if it appears in another agency, year, household, or country.

Children are especially vulnerable because many consequences unfold slowly. Developmental harm, trauma, educational disruption, and chronic illness may become visible years after the original policy decision. By then, the responsible leaders may have left office.

A morally adequate budget must follow the causal chain beyond the program being cut. It must distinguish genuine efficiency from cost transfer.

The question is not whether one line item became smaller. It is whether total human and public costs declined.

9.6 Military Keynesianism and welfare-state opposition

American conservatives often oppose government-directed economic activity when it supports social welfare, public employment, or redistribution. Yet large military expenditures can receive broad support even though they also direct public money into industries, research institutions, infrastructure, and local employment.

This pattern can be described as military Keynesianism: government spending is accepted as economically beneficial when it flows through defense and security institutions, while comparable spending through social programs is criticized as distortion or dependency.

Military contracts create jobs and support manufacturing. Legislators defend facilities and contractors located in their districts. Communities become economically dependent upon federal defense spending without describing themselves as dependent upon government.

The moral language changes because defense is associated with strength, patriotism, technology, and national survival.

Social programs are associated with weakness, need, and redistribution.

The Israel relationship can reinforce this structure because military assistance often circulates through weapons procurement, defense industries, research, and strategic cooperation. The foreign-policy commitment also supports domestic economic interests.

This does not make the policy illegitimate. Defense production may be necessary. The problem is the refusal to acknowledge that both military and social spending involve collective decisions about where government directs resources.

Public financing of a weapons system is treated as national policy. Public financing of therapy is treated as interference in the market. Employment created by defense contracts is celebrated. Employment sustained when a parent receives child care or health treatment is less visible.

The distinction rests partly upon cultural ideas of masculinity, strength, work, and deservingness. Spending that produces force is honorable. Spending that responds to vulnerability is suspect.

A Christian ethic should question this hierarchy. Vulnerability is not a moral failure. Caring for the sick, disabled, hungry, and young is not national weakness. A society that can project force abroad but cannot preserve basic health at home is not necessarily strong.

Military power and human welfare are both elements of national security. A child's healthy development is as much part of a nation's future as a weapons platform.

9.7 Symbolic compensation

Voters do not evaluate politics only through material gain and loss. They seek identity, recognition, dignity, moral belonging, and assurance that their values matter.

Political leaders can provide symbolic compensation when material conditions deteriorate.

An evangelical voter may lose access to local health care, experience rising medical costs, or watch public institutions weaken. Yet the voter may feel represented because leaders affirm Christian language, oppose abortion, defend traditional values, recognize Jerusalem, display solidarity with Israel, or challenge cultural opponents.

The symbolic victory compensates psychologically for material loss.

This compensation is not imaginary. Recognition and belonging are real human goods. People suffer when their identities are mocked or excluded. Political leaders legitimately respond to cultural and religious concerns.

The danger arises when symbolic affirmation is used to conceal policies that injure the same population being affirmed.

A politician may praise family values while reducing support used by families. A leader may call children precious while restricting nutrition or medical care. A party may honor rural culture while allowing rural hospitals to disappear. A candidate may quote Scripture while protecting economic arrangements that burden congregants.

Support for Israel can provide one of the strongest symbolic rewards. It signals prophetic faithfulness, biblical seriousness, opposition to secular elites, and membership in a global moral struggle.

The voter may therefore feel spiritually victorious while becoming materially less secure.

Symbolic compensation helps explain why presenting facts about policy harm may not change political loyalty. The voter is not making a simple economic calculation. The vote protects identity, community, and meaning.

A successful critique must therefore do more than accuse voters of acting against their interests. It must show that their moral identity has been attached to policies that contradict the values they believe they are defending.

The question is not whether symbolism matters. It is whether the symbol has become a substitute for care.

9.8 The child as an unrepresented economic interest

Children are among the least represented interests in political economy. They possess no vote, wealth, property, campaign organization, or direct lobbying power. Adults claim to speak for them, but those adults frequently disagree about what children need or use children to advance unrelated political goals.

Industries can hire lobbyists. Governments can retain diplomatic influence. Professional associations can organize. Wealthy donors can gain access. Children depend upon parents, teachers, physicians, social workers, advocates, churches, and public officials to translate their needs into policy.

Poor children face an additional disadvantage because their families possess limited time and resources for political participation. A parent working multiple jobs, caring for a disabled child, or navigating medical bureaucracy may have little capacity to attend hearings, contact legislators, or organize campaigns.

The economic value of protecting children is also difficult to capture in immediate political terms. Benefits may emerge decades later through better health, education, employment, and reduced public costs. Politicians operating within two-year or four-year election cycles receive limited reward for outcomes that become visible after they leave office.

Children therefore become easy sources of deferred sacrifice. Governments postpone maintenance, accumulate environmental risk, reduce preventive care, tolerate educational inequality, and create debt or military obligations whose consequences will appear later.

Adults consume the political benefit. Children inherit the cost.

This dynamic should make children central to fiscal ethics. Their absence from the bargaining table increases rather than decreases the duty to protect them.

A child-impact analysis should accompany major budget decisions. It should examine direct and indirect effects on health, nutrition, disability, education, family stability, housing, environmental safety, and exposure to violence.

Foreign policy should be subjected to the same analysis. How will military support affect children in the recipient state, neighboring populations, American military families, and future generations? Does the policy reduce long-term danger or perpetuate it? Are children treated as lives to be protected or as costs incorporated into strategy?

The child cannot answer these questions in the legislature. Adults must answer them honestly.

The political economy of sacred and disposable spending is ultimately a system for distributing visibility, protection, and sacrifice. Favored institutions are described as essential. Vulnerable populations are described as costs. Military commitments become obligations. Health and food become entitlements. Defense industries become economic engines. Families receiving assistance become dependents.

This system is not inevitable. It is maintained by language, power, ideology, and political choice.

The Israel exception reveals the structure with unusual clarity. A foreign state may receive sustained assistance protected by strategic and theological claims, while children within evangelical communities experience benefit reductions justified by scarcity and personal responsibility.

The issue is not whether Israel should receive no support. It is whether any commitment should become so sacred that comparison, conditions, accountability, and opportunity costs are forbidden.

A moral budget must ask whose needs are protected before debate begins and whose needs must plead for survival every year.

When weapons are permanent but therapy is optional, when diplomatic protection is guaranteed but food is conditional, and when prophecy commands more political attention than childhood suffering, the budget has become a theology.

The task is to replace sacred spending with accountable spending and disposable children with visible children.

Government should not be judged only by the power it projects or the alliances it preserves. It should be judged by the human capacities it protects, especially among those who cannot purchase influence or defend themselves.

Children are not marginal beneficiaries of public policy. They are the population that will live longest with its consequences.

10. Evangelical Political Self-Harm and Democratic Accountability

10.1 What does it mean to vote against one's interests?

The claim that people vote against their own interests is often used too casually. It assumes that political interest is mainly economic and that voters should select whichever candidate promises the greatest material benefit. Human political behavior is more complex. People vote according to religion, identity, moral conviction, social belonging, historical memory, fear, patriotism, resentment, and beliefs about the future. A voter may knowingly accept material sacrifice for a principle considered more important than personal advantage.

Political self-harm therefore should not be defined merely as voting for lower benefits or higher costs. It occurs when voters support policies that foreseeably weaken their health, families, communities, and institutions while misunderstanding the causal relationship, receiving no proportionate public benefit, or accepting the injury because symbolic issues have displaced material accountability.

An evangelical voter may reasonably decide that a moral issue outweighs financial self-interest. The problem arises when political leaders use that commitment to secure consent for a much larger policy package whose effects remain hidden. Opposition to abortion, concern for religious liberty, or support for Israel may become the gateway through which voters accept reductions in health care, food assistance, disability services, labor protection, public education, or rural infrastructure.

The voter does not enter the polling place intending to close a local hospital, remove therapy from a disabled child, or increase medical insecurity for grandchildren. These consequences arrive later through legislation, appropriations, administrative changes, and provider decisions. Because the harm is indirect, the voter may never connect it to the original political choice.

Political self-harm is therefore often a failure of causal understanding rather than a conscious preference for suffering. The voter chooses a moral identity and receives a material program attached to it.

The phrase must also be used with humility. Poor and rural voters are not uniquely irrational. Wealthy voters, political professionals, academics, and religious leaders also support policies that fail or harm them. Every political group is susceptible to propaganda, motivated reasoning, selective attention, and identity-based judgment.

The distinctive concern here is that evangelical theology can sanctify the mechanism. When political loyalty is associated with biblical faithfulness, ordinary democratic correction becomes more difficult. A failed policy is not merely a failed policy. It belongs to the side understood to defend God, Israel, life, family, and civilization.

Material evidence must then compete with sacred identity.

10.2 Identity as a political benefit

Identity is not an illusion. People need recognition, dignity, belonging, and assurance that their communities matter. A voter may value these goods more highly than a particular tax credit, insurance benefit, or public service.

Many conservative evangelicals believe that American institutions have become hostile to their faith. They may perceive exclusion from education, media, entertainment, professional culture, government agencies, or public morality. Political leaders who speak openly about Christianity can therefore provide a powerful sense of restoration.

The leader tells the evangelical voter: your faith is not shameful, your family is not obsolete, your moral concerns are not irrational, and your community still belongs within the nation.

This recognition has genuine emotional value.

Support for Israel can intensify that value because it connects the voter to a sacred historical drama. The believer is not merely casting a ballot. The believer is standing with biblical Israel, resisting evil, defending civilization, and participating in divine purpose.

Such meaning can outweigh immediate material loss. A voter may tolerate weaker medical access or reduced public support because the political coalition provides dignity and spiritual significance.

Political leaders understand this exchange. Symbolic actions can produce intense loyalty at relatively low political cost. A speech invoking Scripture, a public prayer, a declaration concerning Jerusalem, or a promise of unconditional support for Israel may generate more emotional response than a complex health policy affecting thousands of families.

Identity thus becomes a political benefit that can substitute for institutional performance.

The substitution becomes dangerous when leaders provide recognition without protection. They honor evangelical language while weakening evangelical communities. They praise families while making family care more difficult. They celebrate children while reducing the systems children require. They defend Christian civilization while allowing local hospitals, schools, and social institutions to deteriorate.

The voter is culturally recognized but materially abandoned.

A democratic politics worthy of religious voters should provide both respect and accountability. Identity should not be purchased with the surrender of health, security, or independent judgment.

10.3 Sacrifice interpreted as faithfulness

Christianity contains a strong theology of sacrifice. Believers are taught that faithfulness may require suffering, self-denial, generosity, courage, and resistance to worldly comfort. This tradition has inspired extraordinary acts of service and moral endurance.

It can also be politically exploited.

Material hardship may be reframed as proof that a voter has refused dependency. Loss of public assistance may be presented as recovery of personal responsibility. Economic insecurity may be interpreted as the price of freedom. Opposition to social programs may become evidence that the believer trusts God rather than government.

Sacrifice then acquires moral prestige.

The distinction between voluntary and imposed sacrifice becomes blurred. A Christian may freely give money, time, or comfort for another person. That does not justify political leaders imposing hardship on vulnerable families while protecting powerful interests.

Voluntary sacrifice is morally different from austerity distributed downward.

The problem becomes especially serious when one group is asked to sacrifice for commitments benefiting another. Poor and working families may lose health support while military and geopolitical expenditures remain protected. Rural communities may accept institutional decline while leaders describe foreign commitments as sacred.

The voter may interpret the loss as faithfulness even when the burden was neither necessary nor fairly shared.

Dispensationalist expectations can strengthen this pattern. If history is approaching a final crisis, earthly security may appear less important. Believers may tolerate deteriorating institutions because their hope lies beyond politics. They may support policies believed to advance prophecy even when those policies impose present costs.

Christian hope, however, does not remove responsibility for present suffering. The expectation of divine redemption cannot justify preventable harm to children. Sacrifice is not Christian merely because religious language surrounds it.

A crucial democratic question is therefore: who chooses the sacrifice, who bears it, who benefits from it, and whether the burden is proportionate?

When leaders ask vulnerable people to sacrifice while preserving their own power and favored commitments, the language of faithfulness can become a method of control.

10.4 Coalition loyalty and suppressed dissent

Political coalitions require loyalty. No party can function if every member abandons it over every disagreement. Yet loyalty becomes dangerous when dissent is treated as moral betrayal.

Within some evangelical settings, criticism of conservative economic policy can be labeled socialism, lack of faith, or hostility toward personal responsibility. Criticism of Israeli policy may be labeled antisemitism, abandonment of Israel, or opposition to prophecy. Support for Palestinian civilians may be treated as sympathy for terrorism. Concern about military escalation may be described as weakness.

These accusations narrow the range of acceptable thought.

Pastors, teachers, journalists, politicians, and church members who question the dominant position may face social costs. They may lose audiences, employment, invitations, donations, friendships, or standing within their congregations. The punishment need not be formally organized. It can operate through suspicion, silence, exclusion, and reputational damage.

Suppressed dissent prevents a community from correcting error. Leaders hear only affirmation. Policies become increasingly detached from evidence because critics are removed before their warnings can be evaluated.

This is especially harmful when Israeli and Palestinian voices are selected according to ideological usefulness. Israeli critics of government policy may be ignored. Palestinian Christians may be distrusted. Jewish scholars who reject unconditional support may be treated as unrepresentative. Only voices confirming the established narrative remain visible.

The same filtering affects domestic policy. Health-care professionals, social workers, disabled families, and rural administrators may describe concrete harms, but their testimony is discounted if it conflicts with the party's economic program.

Coalition loyalty then becomes more important than observation.

A healthy religious community should be capable of internal criticism. Biblical prophets did not demonstrate loyalty by remaining silent. They challenged kings, priests, wealthy elites, military confidence, and false assurances of peace.

Dissent can therefore be an act of fidelity rather than rebellion. A coalition that cannot tolerate moral correction has ceased to function democratically and has begun to function devotionally.

10.5 The invisibility of causal chains

Democratic accountability depends upon voters understanding how political decisions produce social outcomes. Modern government makes this difficult because causal chains are long and fragmented.

A voter selects a president, governor, legislator, or party. Months later, a budget is negotiated. An agency then writes regulations. A reimbursement rate changes. A provider reduces services. A family loses access. A child's condition worsens.

At no stage does the original voter see a direct line connecting the ballot to the child.

Political leaders can exploit this distance. They may blame agencies for implementing laws they supported. State officials may blame federal requirements. Federal officials may blame state choices. Legislators may blame providers. Providers may blame reimbursement. Every participant points to another link in the chain.

Responsibility dissolves.

The same problem appears in foreign policy. A voter supports a candidate identified as pro-Israel. Congress authorizes aid. Weapons are transferred. A foreign government chooses how to use them. Military operations cause civilian harm. American leaders then describe themselves as uninvolved in operational decisions.

Legal responsibility may be distributed, but moral participation remains.

Causal invisibility allows voters to experience themselves as supporters of principles rather than participants in consequences. They supported security, not civilian death. They supported fiscal responsibility, not lost therapy. They supported work, not the removal of medical coverage from a parent. They supported Israel, not endless war.

Intent matters, but democratic responsibility cannot end with intent. Citizens and leaders must examine foreseeable outcomes.

A mature political culture teaches people to follow the chain. Who wrote the rule? Who voted for the appropriation? Who imposed the condition? Who supplied the weapon? Who removed the service? Who absorbed the cost?

Without such tracing, elections become rituals of identity rather than instruments of accountability.

10.6 Leaders rewarded for symbolism rather than outcomes

Political leaders are often rewarded for what they symbolize rather than what their policies achieve. A leader may be perceived as strong, Christian, patriotic, pro-family, or pro-Israel even when measurable outcomes contradict those identities.

Symbolic politics is efficient because it produces immediate emotional recognition. A flag, speech, prayer, executive declaration, embassy decision, or public confrontation can be communicated instantly. The preservation of a rural medical network, improvement of disability services, or reduction of childhood hunger requires sustained administration and may produce no dramatic moment.

Leaders therefore gain more visibility from symbolic acts than from institutional maintenance.

A politician can attend a pro-Israel gathering and receive public praise. The same politician may support budgetary changes that reduce local health access. The symbolic action is concentrated and memorable. The domestic harm is dispersed and delayed.

This asymmetry creates weak incentives for governance. Leaders learn that performance matters less than alignment. As long as they affirm the sacred issues, supporters may forgive failures elsewhere.

The result is an accountability deficit. Hospitals can close, benefits can shrink, and family insecurity can rise without significantly changing political loyalty. The leader remains protected by identity.

Children are particularly harmed because most policies affecting them require quiet, competent, long-term administration. Vaccination programs, special education, nutrition systems, maternal care, therapy networks, environmental protection, and safe infrastructure do not usually generate charismatic political spectacle.

Their success is ordinary life continuing without catastrophe.

A democracy dominated by symbolism may therefore neglect the institutions that make ordinary life possible.

The corrective is to judge leaders by outcomes as well as declarations. Did children gain or lose health access? Did rural services improve or deteriorate? Did military policy reduce long-term danger? Did the alliance promote peace or recurring escalation? Did families become more stable?

A leader’s professed values should be tested against the world produced by the leader’s decisions.

10.7 Churches as sites of accountability or reinforcement

Churches can either interrupt political blindness or deepen it.

As sites of moral teaching, community trust, and shared interpretation, churches possess unusual influence. They can help believers distinguish Scripture from party platforms, theology from lobbying, and moral principle from political branding. They can invite testimony from affected families, examine policy consequences, and create space for disagreement.

Churches can also reinforce partisan loyalty. Sermons may repeat political slogans, present one party as the defender of Christianity, or treat support for Israel as a test of biblical faithfulness. Complex questions become simplified into loyalty and betrayal.

When this occurs, congregational trust becomes a political resource.

The church's charitable activity may unintentionally conceal policy failure. Members see food pantries, medical fundraisers, transportation assistance, and emergency benevolence as evidence that the church is fulfilling its duty. The work is valuable, but it may prevent deeper questions about why the need continues to grow.

A congregation can help one family while supporting policies that harm thousands of similar families.

Churches should therefore ask whether charity is being used to repair isolated misfortune or to compensate for systematic deprivation. They should distinguish the personal duty to give from the public duty to govern justly.

The church also has a responsibility to humanize foreign policy. Israeli and Palestinian children should not appear only as symbols of competing narratives. Jewish, Israeli, Palestinian, Arab, and Christian voices should be heard in their diversity.

A church shaped by Christ should be one of the few places where compassion is not controlled by nationality or party.

Its task is not to dictate one detailed policy program. It is to form people capable of truth, mercy, humility, and moral consistency. When churches instead protect leaders from accountability, they become extensions of political machinery.

10.8 Blindness without stupidity

The political blindness described in this paper should not be confused with stupidity. Intelligent, educated, and sincere people can fail to see consequences when identity, authority, fear, and sacred meaning shape perception.

Human beings do not process information as neutral machines. They interpret facts through prior commitments. Evidence consistent with identity is accepted readily. Evidence threatening identity is examined skeptically or rejected.

This process is known in many forms: motivated reasoning, confirmation bias, group loyalty, authority dependence, and cognitive dissonance. These are general human tendencies, not defects unique to evangelicals.

Religious commitment can make them stronger when political beliefs become attached to divine authority. To admit error may then require more than changing one's mind about a policy. It may appear to require questioning trusted pastors, family traditions, prophetic teaching, party identity, and one's understanding of Scripture.

The psychological cost is high.

Blindness is also sustained by unequal information. Most citizens do not read budgets, regulations, military assessments, or policy research. They rely upon trusted intermediaries. If those intermediaries present only one side, even a conscientious person may form distorted conclusions.

The appropriate response is therefore not contempt. Ridicule strengthens defensiveness and confirms the belief that critics are hostile to faith.

The more effective response is moral and evidentiary. It connects policy to persons. It shows how a benefit reduction affects a family, how military escalation affects children on both sides, and how biblical texts have been interpreted differently within Christianity.

It also appeals to values evangelicals already profess: protection of life, care for children, family stability, truthfulness, stewardship, accountability, and resistance to idolatry.

Blindness can be corrected when people are permitted to reconsider without being told that reconsideration requires abandoning their faith.

Democratic accountability depends upon this possibility. Citizens must be able to revise political judgments when outcomes contradict expectations. No party, alliance, or theology of government should become immune to evidence.

The issue is not whether evangelicals possess sufficient intelligence to understand policy. They do. The issue is whether their political and religious institutions encourage them to look.

Political self-harm persists when identity replaces evaluation, sacrifice is romanticized, dissent is punished, causal chains remain hidden, symbolism defeats outcomes, and churches protect coalitions rather than conscience.

The result is a democracy in which leaders can injure their supporters without losing their loyalty.

The deepest injury falls upon children because they cannot vote, leave the coalition, interpret the budget, or demand an accounting. They live inside the consequences of adult identity.

A child-centered democratic ethic therefore asks voters to extend moral responsibility beyond intention. It asks them to examine what their political loyalty builds, removes, funds, excuses, and destroys.

Faithfulness cannot be measured solely by which side a person joins. It must also be measured by whether that allegiance permits the suffering child to be seen.

When political identity prevents that recognition, the task is not to abandon faith. It is to recover moral sight.

11. Toward a Child-Centered Christian Public Ethic

11.1 Jesus and the moral status of children

A child-centered Christian public ethic begins not with national strategy, party identity, or prophetic chronology, but with the place Jesus gave to children. In the social world of the New Testament, children were loved within families but possessed little public authority, economic independence, or legal power. They were dependent members of households rather than autonomous political actors. Jesus repeatedly brought such socially diminished persons into the center of moral attention.

When his disciples treated children as interruptions, Jesus received them. When they argued about greatness, he placed a child among them. When he warned against harming the vulnerable, his language was severe. Children became examples not because childhood was sentimentalized, but because dependence, humility, and lack of status exposed the moral structure of the Kingdom of God.

This pattern challenges political systems that value people according to power, productivity, citizenship, strategic usefulness, or ideological identity. Children cannot purchase influence, reward politicians, or defend themselves from state decisions. Their vulnerability therefore creates an obligation that cannot be reduced to market exchange or partisan calculation.

The moral status of a child does not depend upon nationality. Jesus did not establish one standard of mercy for children belonging to a favored political community and another for children belonging to an enemy population. A child’s value does not increase when the child is Israeli, American, Christian, or economically useful. Nor does it diminish when the child is

Palestinian, Muslim, poor, disabled, undocumented, or born into a family associated with an opposing political cause.

This does not erase the duties of governments to defend their populations or distinguish citizens from noncitizens in particular areas of law. It establishes a deeper moral boundary: no child may be treated as expendable merely because adults classify the child within an undesirable population.

A Christian public ethic should therefore begin every major policy discussion by restoring the child as a person. Before a child is a Medicaid enrollee, refugee, casualty, demographic category, security risk, dependent, or future taxpayer, the child is a human life entrusted to adult care.

The political question becomes more demanding when asked in this order. Instead of asking first whether a policy advances national interest, fulfills prophecy, reduces expenditure, or secures partisan advantage, Christians must ask what the policy does to children who have no control over the circumstances imposed upon them.

This does not automatically determine every answer. It does prevent children from disappearing inside the answer.

11.2 The least of these

The teaching of Jesus concerning “the least of these” has often been applied to personal charity. Christians are encouraged to feed hungry people, visit the sick, welcome strangers, care for prisoners, and assist those in need. These acts are essential to Christian discipleship.

The same teaching also has public implications. Hunger, sickness, imprisonment, displacement, and poverty are not produced solely by individual misfortune. They are shaped by laws, institutions, economic arrangements, wars, and administrative systems. Personal compassion cannot remain disconnected from the structures that repeatedly create or intensify the suffering to which charity responds.

A church may feed a hungry child on Saturday while supporting policies that reduce the child’s access to food during the rest of the week. It may raise money for one family’s medical expenses while voting for leaders who weaken health coverage for thousands of similar families. It may pray for peace while endorsing political commitments that make prolonged war more likely.

The contradiction does not make private charity meaningless. It reveals that charity alone is insufficient.

A child-centered Christian ethic asks whether public policy places disproportionate burdens on those least able to bear them. It asks whether administrative systems serve the vulnerable or

exhaust them. It asks whether government decisions protect families or transfer costs to households already near collapse.

The phrase “the least of these” also challenges selective visibility. The least visible child may be the one whose suffering does not advance the preferred narrative. An evangelical audience may easily see an Israeli child harmed by terrorism because that suffering fits a familiar theological and political frame. It may struggle to see a Palestinian child harmed by military action or an American child harmed by Medicaid reductions because those children complicate the frame.

The moral demand is to see all three.

Christian concern must not operate according to strategic usefulness. A child should not have to prove that the child’s suffering supports the correct side. The child’s vulnerability is itself sufficient reason for attention.

This principle also prevents the language of deservingness from becoming absolute. Adults may debate responsibility, work, law, military conduct, and political blame. Children cannot be made responsible for the failures of their parents, governments, armed organizations, or national histories.

A policy that punishes children in order to discipline adults has failed the test of the least of these.

11.3 Impartial justice

Biblical justice rejects partiality. This does not mean that every situation is identical or that all actors bear equal responsibility. It means that moral standards must not change merely because the person or government being judged belongs to a favored group.

Impartial justice condemns attacks on civilians whether committed by a state, militia, terrorist organization, occupying power, insurgent movement, or military alliance. It condemns hostage-taking, collective punishment, torture, indiscriminate violence, forced displacement, deliberate deprivation, and the use of children as instruments of war.

The same principle applies domestically. A child’s access to food, health care, therapy, education, and safety should not depend upon whether adults consider the child’s family politically sympathetic. Rural evangelical children, urban poor children, immigrant children, disabled children, and children of politically disliked parents possess equal moral worth.

Impartiality is especially necessary when theology has created a favored nation. If the modern State of Israel is treated as uniquely sacred, Christians may apply moral language differently to its actions. Conduct condemned in an adversary may be defended as necessary when

performed by an ally. Civilian deaths caused by one side are personalized; those caused by the other are explained statistically.

Such asymmetry is incompatible with justice.

Impartiality also protects Jewish people from an unjust burden. When the State of Israel is treated as the political embodiment of all Jews, Jewish communities throughout the world may be blamed collectively for policies they did not create and may not support. Distinguishing a government from a people is therefore both morally and practically necessary.

The same distinction must apply to Palestinians. Palestinian civilians are not identical to Hamas, Islamic Jihad, the Palestinian Authority, or any other organization. Children especially cannot be treated as extensions of armed groups.

Impartial justice does not require emotional neutrality. People naturally feel greater attachment to their families, communities, and nations. It requires that attachment not become moral exemption.

A Christian may feel a special historical or theological concern for Israel. That concern must not eliminate the equal obligation to see Palestinian children. An American may feel a special responsibility toward American children. That responsibility must not erase the humanity of children abroad.

The test is whether the same act would be judged differently if the identities of the actors were reversed.

11.4 Peacemaking rather than prophetic acceleration

Christian peacemaking is not passive acceptance of aggression. It may require resistance, protection, negotiation, accountability, and the restraint of violence. It does, however, reject the spiritual romanticization of war.

Dispensationalist prophecy can create a dangerous ambiguity toward conflict. Believers may grieve violence while interpreting it as evidence that history is moving toward divine fulfillment. War becomes both catastrophe and confirmation.

This dual meaning can weaken prevention. If regional conflict is expected, diplomacy may appear futile. If the nations are destined to gather against Israel, political hostility may appear inevitable. If catastrophic events precede Christ's return, worsening conditions may be read less as policy failure than as prophetic progress.

A child-centered Christian ethic rejects prophetic acceleration. Christians are not authorized to encourage, welcome, or excuse conflict because it appears to fit an end-times scheme. The

timing and manner of divine action do not belong to political strategists, lobbying organizations, prophecy broadcasters, or national governments.

The Christian calling is to pursue peace where peace is possible, protect life where life is threatened, and resist the temptation to use suffering as evidence of theological correctness.

Peacemaking requires imagination beyond immediate military victory. It asks what political arrangements could allow Israeli and Palestinian children to grow without inheriting permanent war. It examines whether policies reduce fear, humiliation, dispossession, radicalization, and revenge.

Security remains essential. Israeli children cannot be asked to live under terrorism or recurrent attack. Palestinian children cannot be asked to accept bombing, displacement, deprivation, or indefinite domination as the price of another population's security.

A peace that protects one child by permanently endangering another is unstable. It transfers violence rather than resolving it.

Peacemaking also applies domestically. Social stability depends upon families having access to food, medical care, housing, education, and meaningful opportunity. A government that allows communities to deteriorate while concentrating on cultural conflict produces internal insecurity.

Preventive social investment is therefore a form of peacemaking. It reduces the desperation, illness, trauma, and institutional collapse from which conflict can grow.

The Christian peacemaker does not ask whether catastrophe confirms prophecy. The peacemaker asks what faithful action can prevent children from being consumed by it.

11.5 A consistent pro-life ethic

The language of life occupies a central place in evangelical politics, especially in relation to abortion. Concern for unborn children reflects a serious moral conviction about the dignity of human life.

The credibility of that conviction depends upon consistency.

A pro-life ethic cannot end at birth. It must address prenatal care, maternal health, infant nutrition, pediatric medicine, disability services, environmental hazards, housing safety, food security, war, gun violence, addiction, and the conditions required for children to develop.

This does not mean that every Christian must support the same welfare program, tax policy, or institutional design. It means that the protection of life must remain the governing moral objective after the child enters the world.

The inconsistency becomes visible when politicians receive pro-life recognition while supporting policies that remove health coverage, reduce nutrition assistance, close maternity units, weaken disability services, or expose civilians to disproportionate harm.

A narrow ethic protects life at one politically concentrated stage and treats later needs as matters of individual responsibility. A consistent ethic recognizes that life is embodied and dependent. Children require food, care, shelter, medical treatment, stable relationships, and protection from violence.

The same consistency must apply across borders. Palestinian children do not become less worthy of protection because their deaths occur within a military operation defended by Israel. Israeli children do not become less worthy because critics oppose Israeli government policy. American children do not become less worthy because their parents are poor or receive public assistance.

A consistent pro-life ethic also questions the distribution of risk. Political leaders who advocate force rarely place their own children in immediate danger. Legislators who reduce benefits may never experience the medical systems available to poor families. Moral seriousness requires attention to who makes decisions and who bears their bodily consequences.

Life should not be invoked merely as a partisan identity. It should function as a standard against which the entire political platform is judged.

The question is simple but demanding: does this policy protect human life in practice, especially the lives least able to protect themselves?

11.6 Equal standards for every government

No government is identical to the people it governs, and no government is beyond moral judgment. This principle applies to the United States, Israel, Palestinian authorities, Iran, Arab states, European governments, and every other political institution.

Equal standards do not require identical policy toward every country. Alliances, threats, treaties, historical obligations, and strategic circumstances differ. They require consistency in the moral criteria used to evaluate conduct.

Governments should be judged by how they protect civilians, use force, treat prisoners, administer law, respect human dignity, prevent corruption, and pursue realistic alternatives to violence. Allies should not receive immunity that would be denied to adversaries.

The United States must also be judged by these standards. American support, weapons, intelligence, diplomacy, and financial assistance create forms of responsibility. A government cannot claim complete moral distance from foreseeable uses of the power it supplies.

Equal standards are especially important in religious politics because sacred narratives encourage exceptionalism. American exceptionalism may portray the United States as uniquely righteous. Christian Zionism may portray Israel as uniquely protected. Adversaries may portray themselves as uniquely victimized or divinely authorized.

Every form of national exceptionalism risks converting historical identity into moral immunity.

The biblical prophets rejected such immunity. Their harshest judgments were often directed toward their own rulers and institutions. Prophetic loyalty meant truth-telling within the covenant community, not unconditional defense against criticism.

Christians should recover that model. Support for a country should include willingness to confront its failures. Criticism should seek justice and long-term security rather than humiliation or destruction.

Equal standards also strengthen democratic legitimacy. Citizens are more likely to trust foreign policy when principles are applied consistently rather than manipulated according to alliance and ideology.

For children, equal standards mean that civilian protection cannot depend upon which flag appears above the military operation. A wounded child should not receive a different moral classification because the weapon came from a favored government.

11.7 Conditionality and accountability

Public assistance is almost always conditional. Domestic beneficiaries must meet eligibility requirements, document income, attend reviews, comply with treatment plans, or satisfy work-related rules. Yet military assistance to a powerful ally may be treated as though conditions themselves are offensive.

This asymmetry should be reversed.

Conditionality is not hostility. It is a normal part of accountable relationships. Governments attach conditions to contracts, grants, loans, treaties, and security partnerships. Conditions define purpose, prevent misuse, and preserve public legitimacy.

Military aid should therefore be evaluated according to clear standards. These may include civilian protection, lawful use of weapons, transparent reporting, cooperation with humanitarian access, credible investigation of abuses, and pursuit of defined strategic objectives.

The same principle applies to diplomatic protection. Automatic political shielding can encourage impunity. Friendship should not mean preventing every consequence for misconduct.

Accountability must also operate domestically. When governments cut programs, they should be required to evaluate the effects on children, rural communities, disabled families, and public health. Claimed savings should be compared with costs transferred elsewhere.

Policies should include measurable outcomes and review. Did the work requirement increase employment or merely remove coverage? Did the benefit reduction reduce total costs or increase emergency care? Did military assistance improve security or prolong conflict? Did the strategy protect children over time?

Accountability requires willingness to change course. A policy that becomes sacred cannot be corrected because revision appears disloyal. A democratic policy must remain provisional enough to respond to evidence.

Christian humility supports such revision. Human leaders are fallible. Governments miscalculate. Theological interpretations can be mistaken. Admitting failure is not betrayal of faith; it is recognition that no political program shares divine infallibility.

Conditionality protects the giver, the recipient, civilians, and the future credibility of the alliance. Unconditional support may feel loyal, but it can reward destructive behavior and weaken the very security it intends to preserve.

11.8 Domestic policy as a Christian moral concern

Some evangelicals maintain a sharp distinction between private Christian compassion and public government action. Individuals and churches should care for the poor, they argue, while government should protect order, enforce law, and avoid becoming the primary provider of social welfare.

This position raises legitimate questions about state power, bureaucracy, dependency, and the role of voluntary institutions. It becomes inconsistent when government action is treated as morally necessary in support of Israel but morally illegitimate in support of vulnerable Americans.

If Christians may influence public policy to secure military assistance abroad, they may also evaluate public policy affecting health, food, disability, housing, and children at home.

Domestic policy is not morally neutral. Eligibility rules, reimbursement rates, school funding, environmental protections, and hospital finance govern whether people flourish or suffer. To exclude these matters from Christian ethics is to exclude a large part of lived human vulnerability.

Private charity remains indispensable. It can be personal, relational, flexible, and responsive in ways government programs are not. Yet charity cannot provide national insurance coverage,

maintain an entire rural health system, regulate pollution, finance special education, or guarantee food access for millions of children.

The choice is not between compassionate churches and cold government. It is how public institutions, families, markets, churches, and communities share responsibility.

A Christian public ethic should evaluate government by whether it protects the weak, restrains exploitation, administers justice, and creates conditions in which families and communities can function.

This does not dictate one partisan platform. Christians may disagree over methods. They should not disagree that the consequences for children matter.

Domestic moral concern also corrects the imbalance of prophecy over proximity. It teaches believers to examine what is happening within their own counties, hospitals, schools, congregations, and homes.

The child nearby should not become invisible because the prophetic imagination is focused elsewhere.

11.9 A practical child-impact test

A child-centered public ethic requires more than moral language. It needs a practical method for evaluating policy.

Before adopting a major domestic or foreign policy, decision-makers should ask how it will affect children directly and indirectly. The analysis should include survival, physical health, mental health, nutrition, disability, education, family stability, housing, safety, displacement, and long-term opportunity.

The first question is visibility: which children are affected, and have they been identified as persons rather than categories?

The second is causation: through what chain of decisions will the policy influence their lives?

The third is distribution: which children receive protection, and which bear the risks or costs?

The fourth is necessity: is the harm unavoidable, or do less damaging alternatives exist?

The fifth is proportionality: are the expected benefits sufficient to justify the foreseeable harm?

The sixth is duration: will the effects be temporary, permanent, or transmitted to the next generation?

The seventh is accountability: who will measure outcomes, report harm, and change the policy if its assumptions prove false?

The eighth is equality: would the same policy be defended if the affected children belonged to a different nation, religion, ethnicity, or political group?

Applied domestically, this test would require lawmakers to examine how Medicaid reductions affect pediatric care, parents' health, disabled children, rural providers, and family income. Food-policy changes would be assessed through nutrition, school performance, and household stability rather than budget savings alone.

Applied to foreign policy, the test would examine how weapons transfers, military operations, sanctions, diplomatic protection, and aid conditions affect Israeli and Palestinian children. It would consider immediate security and long-term cycles of trauma and retaliation.

The child-impact test does not guarantee agreement. Evidence may be incomplete, and legitimate values may conflict. It changes the burden of argument. Children can no longer be treated as incidental costs whose suffering is noticed only after the policy is implemented.

A government that claims to protect life should be able to explain what its actions do to children.

Churches can use the same test. Before endorsing candidates or political causes, they can ask whether the associated policies preserve health, family stability, peace, and equal human worth. Sermons about Israel can include the children usually omitted from the prophetic map. Pro-life teaching can follow the child beyond birth.

The child-impact test also disciplines rhetoric. A policy should be described in language that reveals its consequences. Instead of saying that benefits are streamlined, officials should state how many children may lose access. Instead of referring only to collateral damage, leaders should describe the foreseeable civilian effects. Instead of invoking national security generally, they should explain how the policy makes children safer over time.

This approach does not place children above every other moral concern. It prevents adults from placing every other concern above children.

A child-centered Christian public ethic does not require hostility toward Israel, abandonment of national defense, unlimited government spending, or rejection of personal responsibility. It requires consistency. It insists that covenant cannot erase accountability, security cannot erase civilian humanity, fiscal discipline cannot erase bodily need, and prophecy cannot erase children.

Its foundation is not sentimentalism. It is the recognition that power creates responsibility and vulnerability creates moral claim.

The recovery of evangelical moral vision begins when children are no longer sorted into sacred and disposable categories. American, Israeli, and Palestinian children must be seen within one moral field.

They need not occupy identical political positions to possess equal human worth.

The church's public witness will be credible only when its concern for life survives contact with budgets, borders, bombs, disability, hunger, and the consequences of its own political alliances.

A theology that sees children clearly may still confront difficult choices. A theology that does not see them has already chosen wrongly.

12. Conclusion: Seeing Children Before Prophecy

12.1 Summary of the argument

This paper has examined how American evangelical dispensationalism can create an Israel exception within conservative politics. The exception appears when principles ordinarily associated with "America First" government—limited foreign aid, skepticism toward military entanglement, fiscal restraint, national self-prioritization, and resistance to international obligations—are suspended in relation to the modern State of Israel.

The suspension is not usually presented as a simple strategic choice. It is often defended through theology. Biblical promises to Abraham, prophetic texts concerning Israel and Jerusalem, the distinction between Israel and the Church, and expectations about the end times are converted into claims about contemporary American military assistance, diplomacy, territory, and political loyalty.

The paper has argued that this conversion is not biblically automatic. Biblical Israel, the Jewish people, and the modern State of Israel are historically related but cannot be collapsed into one undifferentiated political category. The Bible does not declare every action of Israel's rulers righteous. The prophets repeatedly condemned national injustice, military arrogance, corruption, oppression, and false confidence in sacred status. Covenant intensified accountability rather than eliminating it.

The New Testament likewise contains no command directing a future American government to provide unconditional military, financial, or diplomatic support to a modern nation-state. Christians may support Israel for strategic, historical, humanitarian, or theological reasons. They may regard Israel's survival and Jewish security as matters of profound moral importance. What they cannot responsibly claim is that one particular American foreign-policy arrangement is stated directly and unambiguously in Scripture.

The political consequences of this theology extend beyond the Middle East. When support for Israel becomes a sacred test of evangelical identity, it can protect a larger partisan package from scrutiny. Voters may support politicians because those politicians affirm Israel, abortion restrictions, conservative judges, Christian language, and cultural identity. The same leaders may also reduce Medicaid, nutrition assistance, disability services, rehabilitation, rural health infrastructure, or other programs used by evangelical families and communities.

The result is a hierarchy of protected and disposable commitments. Military assistance and diplomatic support become moral obligations. Therapy, food, maternal care, disability services, and rural medical access become optional expenditures.

Children occupy the center of this hierarchy's consequences. American children may lose health access, nutrition, family stability, or support for disability. Palestinian children may experience injury, hunger, displacement, bereavement, interrupted education, and the destruction of ordinary life. Israeli children may experience terrorism, hostage-taking, rocket attacks, fear, displacement, bereavement, and life within a permanently militarized society.

The moral crisis is not solved by selecting one group of children as innocent and treating the others as politically complicated. A child-centered Christian ethic must see all of them.

12.2 From inconsistency to blindness

The Israel exception is clearly inconsistent with a strict America First political philosophy. A movement cannot coherently condemn foreign aid, overseas entanglement, and government expenditure in general while treating one foreign commitment as permanently exempt without explaining the principle that justifies the distinction.

Yet inconsistency alone does not fully explain the phenomenon.

Many evangelicals do not knowingly hold contradictory positions. They understand Israel through a theological narrative that assigns it a unique role in sacred history. Within that narrative, assistance to Israel is not ordinary foreign aid. It is blessing, obedience, covenantal fidelity, protection of God's people, and participation in prophecy.

Domestic programs are interpreted through a different narrative. Medicaid may represent dependency. Nutrition assistance may represent entitlement. Disability support may represent government expansion. Public health may represent bureaucracy. The same act of collective provision is judged through different moral vocabularies according to the recipient.

This is why blindness is the more important category.

Blindness is not an inability to see any suffering. Evangelical individuals and churches often respond generously to illness, poverty, disaster, adoption, foster care, hunger, and family crisis.

The blindness concerns which suffering enters political judgment and which remains separated from it.

A church may help a family pay a medical bill without questioning why medical debt has become common. It may operate a food pantry without examining policies that increase food insecurity. It may support Israel passionately without hearing Palestinian Christians or confronting the effects of war on children. It may pray for Israeli safety without asking whether unconditional military support contributes to a future of recurring danger for Israelis themselves.

The believer's compassion remains personal while political causation remains invisible.

Blindness is also created through differences in presentation. Israel is presented through narrative, Scripture, history, terrorism, flags, sermons, tours, prophecy conferences, and emotionally powerful media. Domestic austerity arrives through reimbursement changes, eligibility reviews, administrative notices, budget categories, and provider closures. Palestinian suffering may arrive through disputed casualty totals, military terminology, or images whose credibility is immediately challenged.

One form of need is sacred and vivid. Another is technical and remote.

The result is unequal moral visibility. Some children are named, photographed, mourned, and placed within stories of innocence. Others remain statistics, dependents, collateral damage, demographic threats, or residents of hostile territory.

Blindness therefore describes a structured moral failure. It is produced through theology, language, partisan identity, media selection, institutional distance, and the fragmentation of responsibility.

Its correction requires more than accusing believers of hypocrisy. It requires restoring the children hidden by the narrative.

12.3 The danger of sacred immunity

No modern nation should possess sacred immunity. Governments are human institutions. They are composed of leaders, parties, bureaucracies, courts, security forces, economic interests, and competing constituencies. They make wise decisions and disastrous ones. They protect life and sometimes destroy it. They require criticism, law, accountability, and restraint.

When a state is placed within a prophetic framework, its political status can change in the believer's imagination. The state becomes more than a state. It becomes an instrument of divine history.

Sacred immunity then develops.

Criticism of military action may be interpreted as opposition to Israel's existence. Criticism of an Israeli government may be interpreted as hostility toward Jews. Questions about American aid may be interpreted as refusal to bless Israel. Concern for Palestinians may be interpreted as sympathy for terrorism. Advocacy for diplomatic restraint may be interpreted as resistance to prophecy.

These collapses are dangerous because they prevent distinctions that moral judgment requires.

The Jewish people are not identical to the Israeli state. The Israeli state is not identical to a particular government. A government is not identical to its prime minister or governing coalition. Israel's right to exist is not identical to every territorial claim. Israel's right to defend civilians is not identical to every military method. Criticism of policy is not identical to antisemitism.

The same precision must apply to Palestinians. Palestinian civilians are not identical to armed organizations. Palestinian Christians are not outside Christian concern. Palestinian children cannot be treated as extensions of adult militants or political authorities.

Sacred immunity harms the supposedly protected nation as well. A government that expects unconditional support has less incentive to reconsider destructive strategies. Political leaders may take greater risks when they believe military, financial, and diplomatic backing will continue regardless of outcome.

A friend who cannot criticize ceases to be a reliable friend.

Sacred immunity also corrupts democracy within the United States. Citizens may be discouraged from examining the use of public money, the legality of weapons transfers, the risks of regional escalation, or the relationship between foreign commitments and domestic priorities. Theological claims can substitute for public reasoning.

This is particularly troubling in a religiously plural society. Citizens who do not share dispensationalist interpretations should not be required to accept those interpretations as unquestionable grounds for national policy. Even Christians who reject dispensationalism should not be told that their disagreement constitutes biblical disobedience.

No political alliance should become an article of faith. No military appropriation should function as a sacrament. No government should be permitted to stand where only God may stand.

12.4 The recovery of evangelical moral vision

The critique developed in this paper is not an argument for abandoning evangelical faith. It is an argument for recovering its moral center.

Evangelicalism has historically emphasized conversion, biblical authority, personal discipleship, missionary concern, and the transforming work of Christ. These commitments can support moral clarity rather than blindness. The Bible contains abundant resources for criticizing national arrogance, defending the vulnerable, confronting rulers, and refusing idolatrous political loyalty.

The recovery begins with interpretive humility. Christians should acknowledge that dispensationalism is one historical theological system rather than the only possible reading of Scripture. Its claims about Israel, the Church, prophecy, the rapture, and the end times have been disputed by other Christians for generations.

Humility does not require abandoning conviction. It requires distinguishing conviction from certainty about matters on which serious believers disagree.

The recovery also requires a return to the prophetic tradition in its full moral force. Prophecy is not primarily a code for matching headlines to predictions. Biblical prophets confronted injustice, false worship, corrupt leadership, exploitation, violence, and confidence in military power. They refused to reassure rulers merely because those rulers governed a covenant people.

A restored prophetic voice would judge American and Israeli power rather than sanctify it.

The teaching of Jesus provides an even clearer center. Jesus placed children, the sick, the poor, outsiders, and socially diminished people within the field of divine attention. He challenged the domination of the powerful and rejected the use of violence to secure his own mission. He called his followers to mercy, truth, peacemaking, humility, and enemy-love.

These teachings cannot be confined to personal behavior while foreign and domestic policy are exempted. Public decisions determine whether children eat, receive medical care, remain with families, survive war, attend school, and grow without permanent fear.

Evangelical moral vision must therefore include policy consequences.

Churches can participate in this recovery by widening the range of voices they hear. They can listen to Israeli families, Palestinian Christians, Jewish critics and supporters of Israeli policy, humanitarian workers, military analysts, disabled families, rural clinicians, and parents affected by benefit reductions.

They can teach congregants to distinguish the biblical text from the notes, charts, novels, broadcasts, and partisan interpretations built around it.

They can also resist the reduction of Christianity to a party package. No political coalition fully embodies Christian ethics. Every party combines legitimate concerns, moral failures, interest-

group pressure, and institutional ambition. Christian discipleship requires independent judgment.

The recovery of vision means learning to ask not merely which party affirmed Israel, which candidate used Christian language, or which policy appeared to fit prophecy, but who was fed, healed, protected, displaced, injured, impoverished, or killed.

It means following the causal chain from vote to budget, from budget to regulation, from regulation to provider, from provider to household, and from household to child.

12.5 Children as the measure of policy

Children cannot be the only measure of public policy, but they are among its clearest moral measures.

They reveal the consequences adults prefer to hide because they possess little responsibility for the conditions imposed upon them. A child did not design the health system, begin the war, choose the governing party, create the armed organization, negotiate the alliance, or write the eligibility rule.

The child receives the outcome.

A policy affecting children should therefore bear a special burden of justification. Leaders should be required to explain what harm is expected, why it is necessary, which alternatives were considered, who will monitor the consequences, and what will trigger revision.

Domestic austerity should be judged by more than projected savings. It should be judged by children's health, nutrition, education, housing stability, disability support, family integrity, and long-term development.

A Medicaid reduction that produces a smaller budget but greater untreated illness is not necessarily efficient. A therapy cut that increases disability, parental unemployment, emergency care, or institutional placement may be financially and morally irrational. A food-benefit reduction that worsens health and school performance transfers costs rather than eliminating them.

Foreign policy should be evaluated in the same way.

Military assistance should be judged not only by weapons delivered, deterrence claimed, or alliances reaffirmed, but by whether it reduces long-term danger to Israeli and Palestinian children. A strategy that repeatedly produces bereavement, displacement, radicalization, and fear may achieve tactical objectives while failing the larger test of security.

Children also reveal the falsity of selective innocence. Israeli children are not responsible for the actions of their government. Palestinian children are not responsible for the actions of armed groups. American children are not responsible for parental poverty or illness.

No child should be required to earn recognition by belonging to the politically favored population.

A child-impact test should therefore accompany major policy. It should ask:

Which children are affected?

How are their bodies, families, education, development, and future altered?

Are some children individualized while others remain statistical?

Would the policy be defended with equal confidence if the children's nationalities were reversed?

Are the burdens being placed upon those who had no role in creating the conflict or fiscal problem?

Will the policy reduce future danger, or merely transfer it to another generation?

These questions do not remove tragedy from politics. Some choices remain difficult. Governments may confront genuine threats, limited resources, and situations in which every available action carries risk.

The child-centered standard does not demand moral innocence from government. It demands moral honesty.

Children must not be hidden so adults can feel innocent.

12.6 Final conclusion

The deepest problem with the Israel exception is not that it violates the slogan "America First." America First is itself a political doctrine rather than a biblical command. The deeper problem is that dispensationalist loyalty can elevate a modern state above ordinary moral scrutiny while diminishing attention to the vulnerable people most affected by domestic and foreign policy.

The exception is not plainly commanded by Scripture. It is the product of a historical theological system, popular Bible commentary, prophecy teaching, mass media, political organization, lobbying, and partisan identity. It has become powerful because many believers experience it not as one interpretation among others but as biblical faithfulness itself.

That conviction can produce blindness.

It can make military aid appear sacred while health care appears optional. It can make the security of one population vivid while the suffering of another remains abstract. It can make a distant flag more emotionally powerful than a nearby child losing therapy. It can turn war into prophetic evidence and austerity into personal responsibility. It can allow leaders to reward evangelical voters symbolically while weakening their communities materially.

Most seriously, it can divide children into categories of sacred and disposable innocence.

This paper rejects that division.

American children affected by poverty, disability, illness, hunger, addiction, rural decline, and family instability must be seen. Israeli children affected by terrorism, hostage-taking, war, fear, and militarization must be seen. Palestinian children affected by bombing, displacement, hunger, injury, occupation, bereavement, and destroyed institutions must be seen.

Seeing them together does not erase history, deny security threats, equalize every responsibility, or provide an effortless solution to conflict. It establishes the moral field in which responsible solutions must be sought.

No modern government is covenant itself. No political leader is prophecy embodied. No military alliance is the Kingdom of God. No national interest erases the image of God in a child.

A theology should be judged not only by the texts it cites but by the lives it teaches believers to notice. If it magnifies sacred geography while diminishing suffering children, it has mistaken the map for the moral world. If it offers certainty about the end of history while weakening responsibility within history, it has turned hope into evasion. If it protects a government from criticism while exposing children to harm, it has confused faithfulness with allegiance.

The recovery of Christian political vision begins with a reversal: children before prophecy, persons before symbols, accountability before immunity, peacemaking before apocalyptic excitement, and mercy before partisan loyalty.

A nation may be strategically important. An alliance may be defensible. A theological tradition may possess insight. None of them is entitled to make a child invisible.

The final Christian test is not whether believers stood unconditionally with a state, party, or prophetic system. It is whether they saw the vulnerable people placed before them and refused to look away.

13. References

13.1 Biblical and Primary Theological Sources

1. The Holy Bible, New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition. National Council of Churches, 2021. Relevant texts include Genesis 12:1–3; Exodus 22:21–24; Deuteronomy 10:17–19; Isaiah 1:10–17; 10:1–4; Jeremiah 7:1–15; Amos 5:21–24; Micah 3:1–12; 6:8; Matthew 5:1–12, 43–48; 18:1–14; 19:13–15; 25:31–46; Mark 9:33–42; 10:13–16; Luke 4:16–21; 10:25–37; Romans 2:1–11; 9–11; Galatians 3:6–29; and Revelation 21–22.

2. Darby, John Nelson. The Hopes of the Church of God, in Connection with the Destiny of the Jews and the Nations as Revealed in Prophecy. Lectures delivered in Geneva, 1840. Available through the J. N. Darby writings archive: https://www.stempublishing.com/authors/darby/

3. Darby, John Nelson. Synopsis of the Books of the Bible. Five volumes. London: G. Morrish, nineteenth-century editions. Electronic archive: https://www.stempublishing.com/authors/darby/

4. Scofield, C. I., ed. The Scofield Reference Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 1909; revised edition, 1917.

5. Blackstone, William E. Jesus Is Coming. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1878.

6. Chafer, Lewis Sperry. Systematic Theology. Eight volumes. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947–1948.

7. Walvoord, John F. The Millennial Kingdom. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959.

8. Lindsey, Hal, with C. C. Carlson. The Late Great Planet Earth. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970.

9. LaHaye, Tim, and Jerry B. Jenkins. Left Behind: A Novel of the Earth's Last Days. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, 1995.

10. Hagee, John. Jerusalem Countdown: A Warning to the World. Lake Mary, Florida: FrontLine, 2005.

11. Christians United for Israel. "About CUFI." Organizational materials and policy statements. https://cufi.org/about/

13.2 Historical Studies of Dispensationalism and Christian Zionism

12. Ariel, Yaakov. On Behalf of Israel: American Fundamentalist Attitudes Toward Jews, Judaism, and Zionism, 1865–1945. Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing, 1991.

13. Boyer, Paul. When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992.

14. Merkley, Paul Charles. The Politics of Christian Zionism, 1891–1948. London: Frank Cass, 1998.

15. Gorenberg, Gershom. The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount. New York: Free Press, 2000.

16. Weber, Timothy P. On the Road to Armageddon: How Evangelicals Became Israel's Best Friend. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.

17. Sizer, Stephen. Christian Zionism: Road-Map to Armageddon? Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2004. https://ivpbooks.com/christian-zionism-pb

18. Goldman, Shalom. Zeal for Zion: Christians, Jews, and the Idea of the Promised Land. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

19. Mangum, R. Todd, and Mark S. Sweetnam. The Scofield Bible: Its History and Impact on the Evangelical Church. Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2009.

20. Lewis, Donald M. The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

21. Sutton, Matthew Avery. American Apocalypse: A History of Modern Evangelicalism. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014.

22. Bivins, Jason C. Religion of Fear: The Politics of Horror in Conservative Evangelicalism. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

23. Mead, Walter Russell. "God's Country?" Foreign Affairs 85, no. 5, 2006: 24–43.

24. Isaac, Munther. The Other Side of the Wall: A Palestinian Christian Narrative of Lament and Hope. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2020.

25. Kairos Palestine. A Moment of Truth: A Word of Faith, Hope and Love from the Heart of Palestinian Suffering. Bethlehem, 2009. https://www.kairospalestine.ps/

26. Oxford University Press. "The Centenary of The Scofield Reference Bible." OUPblog, April 5, 2017. https://blog.oup.com/2017/04/scofield-reference-bible-centenary/

27. Museum of the Bible. "Scofield Reference Bible, First Edition." Collections description. https://collections.museumofthebible.org/artifacts/57905-scofield-reference-bible-first-edition

13.3 Evangelical Politics, Public Opinion, and Political Psychology

28. Pew Research Center. “American Evangelicals and Israel.” April 15, 2005. https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2005/04/15/american-evangelicals-and-israel/

29. Pew Research Center. “God’s Country? Evangelicals and U.S. Foreign Policy.” September 26, 2006. https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2006/09/26/gods-country-evangelicals-and-us-foreign-policy/

30. Pew Research Center. “More White Evangelicals Than American Jews Say God Gave Israel to the Jewish People.” October 3, 2013. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2013/10/03/more-white-evangelicals-than-american-jews-say-god-gave-israel-to-the-jewish-people/

31. Pew Research Center. “Modest Warming in U.S. Views on Israel and Palestinians.” May 26, 2022. https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2022/05/26/modest-warming-in-u-s-views-on-israel-and-palestinians/

32. Pew Research Center. “How Americans View Israel and the Israel-Hamas War at the Start of Trump’s Second Term.” April 8, 2025. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/04/08/how-americans-view-israel-and-the-israel-hamas-war-at-the-start-of-trumps-second-term/

33. Pew Research Center. “White Evangelicals Continue to Stand Out in Their Support for Trump.” April 28, 2025. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/04/28/white-evangelicals-continue-to-stand-out-in-their-support-for-trump/

34. Pew Research Center. “White Evangelicals Remain Among Trump’s Strongest Supporters, but They’re Less Supportive Than a Year Ago.” February 9, 2026. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2026/02/09/white-evangelicals-remain-among-trumps-strongest-supporters-but-theyre-less-supportive-than-a-year-ago/

35. Pew Research Center. “Negative Views of Israel, Netanyahu Continue to Rise Among Americans, Especially Young People.” April 7, 2026. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2026/04/07/negative-views-of-israel-netanyahu-continue-to-rise-among-americans-especially-young-people/

36. Pew Research Center. What Political Issues Do Americans Hear About in Church? May 27, 2026. https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2026/05/27/what-political-issues-do-americans-hear-about-in-church/

37. Public Religion Research Institute. A Christian Nation? Understanding the Threat of Christian Nationalism to American Democracy and Culture. February 8, 2023. https://prri.org/research/a-christian-nation-understanding-the-threat-of-christian-nationalism-to-american-democracy-and-culture/

38. Public Religion Research Institute. Challenges to Democracy: The 2024 Election in Focus—Findings from the 2024 American Values Survey. October 16, 2024. https://prri.org/research/challenges-to-democracy-the-2024-election-in-focus-findings-from-the-2024-american-values-survey/

39. Whitehead, Andrew L., and Samuel L. Perry. Taking America Back for God: Christian Nationalism in the United States. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.

40. Gorski, Philip S., and Samuel L. Perry. The Flag and the Cross: White Christian Nationalism and the Threat to American Democracy. New York: Oxford University Press, 2022.

41. Mason, Lilliana. Uncivil Agreement: How Politics Became Our Identity. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.

42. Edelman, Murray. Constructing the Political Spectacle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

43. Herd, Pamela, and Donald P. Moynihan. Administrative Burden: Policymaking by Other Means. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2018.

44. Kunda, Ziva. "The Case for Motivated Reasoning." Psychological Bulletin 108, no. 3, 1990: 480–498. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480

45. Bandura, Albert. "Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities." Personality and Social Psychology Review 3, no. 3, 1999: 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0303_3

46. Tetlock, Philip E., Orie V. Kristel, S. Beth Elson, Melanie C. Green, and Jennifer S. Lerner. "The Psychology of the Unthinkable: Taboo Trade-Offs, Forbidden Base Rates, and Heretical Counterfactuals." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 78, no. 5, 2000: 853–870. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.5.853

13.4 United States–Israel Assistance and Federal Fiscal Policy

47. White House. "Fact Sheet: Memorandum of Understanding Reached with Israel." September 14, 2016. https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/09/14/fact-sheet-memorandum-understanding-reached-israel

48. United States Department of State. “U.S. Security Cooperation with Israel.” Updated April 25, 2025. https://www.state.gov/u-s-security-cooperation-with-israel

49. Sharp, Jeremy M. U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel: Overview and Developments Since October 7, 2023. Congressional Research Service Report RL33222, revised May 28, 2025. https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/RL33222

50. Congressional Budget Office. Preliminary Analysis of the Distributional Effects of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. May 20, 2025. https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2025-05/61422-Reconciliation-Distributional-Analysis.pdf

51. Congressional Budget Office. Estimated Budgetary Effects of Public Law 119-21. July 21, 2025. https://www.cbo.gov/publication/61570

52. Congressional Budget Office. Distributional Effects of Public Law 119-21. August 11, 2025. https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2025-08/61367-Distributional-Effects.pdf

53. Congressional Budget Office. The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2026 to 2036. February 2026. https://www.cbo.gov/publication/61882

13.5 Medicaid, Chronic Pain, Food Security, Disability, and Rural Health

54. Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission. “Mandatory and Optional Benefits.” March 15, 2021. https://www.macpac.gov/subtopic/mandatory-and-optional-benefits/

55. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. “Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment.” https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/benefits/early-and-periodic-screening-diagnostic-and-treatment

56. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Best Practices for Adhering to Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment Requirements. State Health Official Letter 24-005, September 26, 2024. https://www.medicaid.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/sho24005.pdf

57. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. EPSDT Coverage Guide for States. May 2026. https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/benefits/downloads/epsdt-coverage-guide.pdf

58. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Missouri State Plan Amendment MO-18-0007: Alternative Therapies for the Management of Chronic Pain. Approved March 20, 2019. https://www.medicaid.gov/State-resource-center/Medicaid-State-Plan-Amendments/Downloads/MO/MO-18-0007.pdf

59. Missouri Department of Social Services, MO HealthNet Division. “Complementary Health and Alternative Therapies for Chronic Pain Management—Pre-Certification.” February 24, 2020. https://mydss.mo.gov/mhd/hot-tips/complementary-health-and-alternative-therapies-chronic-pain-management-pre

60. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Missouri State Plan Amendment MO-25-0022. Approved May 13, 2026, effective July 1, 2026. https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/spa/downloads/MO-25-0022.pdf

61. Missouri Department of Social Services, MO HealthNet Division. Notice that payment for physical therapy, acupuncture, and chiropractic services under the chronic-pain complementary-health program will end July 1, 2026. https://mydss.mo.gov/mhd

62. Missouri Department of Social Services, MO HealthNet Division. “Therapy.” https://mydss.mo.gov/mhd/therapy

63. Dowell, Deborah, Kathleen Ragan, Christopher Jones, Grant Baldwin, and Roger Chou. “CDC Clinical Practice Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Pain—United States, 2022.” MMWR Recommendations and Reports 71, no. 3, 2022: 1–95. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.rr7103a1

64. Qaseem, Amir, Timothy J. Wilt, Robert M. McLean, and Mary Ann Forciea. “Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline from the American College of Physicians.” Annals of Internal Medicine 166, no. 7, 2017: 514–530. https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-2367

65. Skelly, Andrea C., Roger Chou, Joseph R. Dettori, et al. Noninvasive Nonpharmacological Treatment for Chronic Pain: A Systematic Review Update. Comparative Effectiveness Review No. 227. Rockville, Maryland: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2020. https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/products/noninvasive-nonpharm-pain-update/research

66. United States Government Accountability Office. Rural Hospital Closures: Affected Residents Had Reduced Access to Health Care Services. GAO-21-93, January 2021. https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-21-93

67. United States Government Accountability Office. Availability of Hospital-Based Obstetric Care in Rural Areas. GAO-23-105515, October 2022. https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-23-105515

68. Rabbitt, Matthew P., Laura J. Hales, Michael P. Burke, and Alisha Coleman-Jensen. Household Food Security in the United States in 2024. Economic Research Report No.

358. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 2025. https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/113622

69. Gundersen, Craig, and James P. Ziliak. “Food Insecurity and Health Outcomes.” Health Affairs 34, no. 11, 2015: 1830–1839. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2015.0645

70. Shonkoff, Jack P., Andrew S. Garner, and the Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health. “The Lifelong Effects of Early Childhood Adversity and Toxic Stress.” Pediatrics 129, no. 1, 2012: e232–e246. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2011-2663

71. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Vibrant and Healthy Kids: Aligning Science, Practice, and Policy to Advance Health Equity. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2019. https://doi.org/10.17226/25466

13.6 Children, Armed Conflict, Trauma, and International Humanitarian Law

72. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of the Child. Adopted November 20, 1989. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child

73. International Committee of the Red Cross. “Protected Persons: Civilians.” https://www.icrc.org/en/law-and-policy/protected-persons-civilians

74. International Committee of the Red Cross. “Children Protected Under International Humanitarian Law.” https://www.icrc.org/en/document/protected-persons/children-protected-international-humanitarian-law-ihl

75. International Committee of the Red Cross. “Frequently Asked Questions: Our Work in Israel and the Occupied Territories.” https://www.icrc.org/en/document/FAQ-icrc-work-Israel-and-occupied-territories

76. International Committee of the Red Cross. Customary International Humanitarian Law, Rule 55: Access for Humanitarian Relief to Civilians in Need. https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/customary-ihl/v1/rule55

77. UNICEF. “UNICEF’s Role in Israel and the State of Palestine.” https://www.unicef.org/unicef-role-israel-state-of-palestine

78. UNICEF. “Statement by Catherine Russell, UNICEF Executive Director, Following Her Two-Day Visit to the Middle East.” April 16, 2024. https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/statement-catherine-russell-unicef-executive-director-following-her-two-day-visit

79. UNICEF. State of Palestine Humanitarian Situation Report No. 38. April 2025. https://www.unicef.org/documents/state-palestine-humanitarian-situation-report-no-38-april-2025

80. UNICEF. State of Palestine Humanitarian Situation Report No. 42. August 2025. https://www.unicef.org/sop/reports/unicef-state-palestine-escalation-humanitarian-situation-report-no42

81. UNICEF. "UNICEF in the State of Palestine Humanitarian Situation Update." February 6, 2026. https://www.unicef.org/sop/reports/unicef-state-palestine-humanitarian-situation-update

82. World Health Organization. "Conflict in Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territory." https://www.who.int/emergencies/situations/conflict-in-Israel-and-oPt

83. World Health Organization. Health Conditions in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, Including East Jerusalem. Executive Board document EB158/25, January 20, 2026. https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB158/B158_25-en.pdf

84. Abuelaish, Izzeldin. "Reviving and Rebuilding the Health System in Gaza." Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal 31, no. 2, 2025. https://www.emro.who.int/emhj-volume-31-2025/volume-31-issue-2/reviving-and-rebuilding-the-health-system-in-gaza.html

85. Latif, Shahid. "Cases of Trauma Due to War and Violence Among Children in Gaza." Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal 31, no. 4, 2025. https://www.emro.who.int/emhj-volume-31-2025/volume-31-issue-4/cases-of-trauma-due-to-war-and-violence-among-children-in-gaza.html

86. Wagner, Glenn J., et al. "Exposure to Violence and Its Relationship to Mental Health Among Young People in Palestine." Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal 26, no. 2, 2020. https://www.emro.who.int/emhj-volume-26-2020/volume-26-issue-2/exposure-to-violence-and-its-relationship-to-mental-health-among-young-people-in-palestine.html

87. State Comptroller and Ombudsman of Israel. The October 7th Terror Attack and the Iron Swords War: Government Treatment of Mental Health Needs. 2025. https://www.mevaker.gov.il/en/newsroom/20250211-swords-of-iron

88. Government of Israel. Reply to the Additional List of Issues Submitted to the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. 2024. https://www.gov.il/BlobFolder/dynamiccollectorresultitem/hr-6/he/HumanRightsConvention_CRC_2024.pdf

89. Refaeli, Tehila, et al. “Post-Traumatic Stress Among Adolescents Following the October 7, 2023 Attack and Subsequent War in Israel.” 2025. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12699908/

90. Masten, Ann S., and Angela J. Narayan. “Child Development in the Context of Disaster, War, and Terrorism: Pathways of Risk and Resilience.” Annual Review of Psychology 63, 2012: 227–257. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100356

91. Miller, Kenneth E., and Andrew Rasmussen. “War Exposure, Daily Stressors, and Mental Health in Conflict and Post-Conflict Settings.” Social Science & Medicine 70, no. 1, 2010: 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.09.027

The author has published over 5,600 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.